DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 016 VT 011 289

TITLE Delinquency and Public Policy: Educational and Vocational Problems of 14- and 15 -Year-Old Parolees and Probationers.

INSTITUTION New York Univ., N.Y. Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Jun 69

NOTE 56p.; Summary of Proceedings of a Workshop (Carnegie International Center, New York, N.Y., June 17-18, 1969) Programs; Public Policy; *Disadvantaged Youth; Unemployed; Work Study Programs; Federal Programs; Attendance; Probation Officers; Parole Officers; Workshops

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.90

DESCRIPTORS Attendance, *Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Problems, *Educational Programs, Federal Programs, Parole Officers, Policy, Probation Officers, Public Policy, Unemployed, Workshops, Work Study Programs, *Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

The 39 participants attended a 2-day conference which focused on the special problems of youth between 14 and 16 years of age who are on probation or on parole. Many are not attending school, but because of their age, these youths have great difficulty in finding employment, are not eligible for enrollment in government-sponsored community work programs, and cannot enter the military services. Also, community services and organized programs are often not available to them. Major workshop presentations were: (1) "Employment of Youth- by Eli E. Cohen and (2) "Survey of Parole and Probation Officers, New York State" by Michael Munk. Discussions followed the presentations, and participants made short-and long-range policy recommendations to help alleviate problems. Short-range recommendations were made concerning the Job Corps, work-study programs, private educational alternatives, union and business involvement, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and girls' problems, while long-range recommendations were made for foreign experience, compulsory school attendance or work, delinquency and public policy, and the labor market. (SB)

ED042016

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF A WORKSHOP:

DELINQUENCY AND PUBLIC POLICY: EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF 14- AND 15-YEAR-OLD PAROLEES AND PROBATIONERS

VT011289

nter for Study of the Unemployed
aduate School of Social Work
w York University

New York University
Graduate School of Social Work
Alex Rosen, Dean

•

Center For Study of The Unemployed
Stanley Sadofsky, Director
Melvin Herman, Associate Director

•

853 Broadway
New York, New York 10003

ED042016

DELINQUENCY AND PUBLIC POLICY: EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF 14- AND 15-YEAR-OLD PAROLEES AND PROBATIONERS

Summary of Proceedings of a Workshop Sponsored by:
Center for Study of the Unemployed
Graduate School of Social Work
New York University
June 17-18, 1969
Carnegie International Center
New York City

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This publication is part of a project conducted by the Center for Study of the Unemployed of the New York University Graduate School of Social Work under a grant provided by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to develop curriculum materials for program planners and operators.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Mr. Winton Ahlstrom	Institute for Community Studies Kansas City, Missouri
Mrs. Freida Altes	Bureau of Attendance N.Y.C. Board of Education New York, New York
Mrs. Gida Cavicchia	Board of Education New York City, New York
Mr. Walter Clark	Fordham University Bronx, New York
Mr. Eli Cohen	National Committee on Employment of Youth New York, New York
Mr. Harold Dance	Neighborhood Youth Corps Washington, D. C.
Mr. Peter Damiano	Youth Parole Supervisor Rochester, New York
Miss Roberta Dorn	Office of Law Enforcement Department of Justice Washington, D. C.
Mr. Harry Dworkin	Children's Bureau Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Joyce Epstein	New York State Division for Youth New York City, New York
Mrs. Edward First	Public Education Association New York City, New York
Mr. Arthur Golden	Community Services Bureau of Metropolitan New York New York, New York
Mr. Franz Groemping	Bureau of Labor Statistics Department of Labor Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Blanche Katz	Public Education Association New York City, New York
Mr. Jacob Kaufman	Penn State University State College, Pennsylvania
Mr. George Kelling	Commando I Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Mrs. Pamela Levin	Citizens Committee for Children New York City, New York
Mr. Samuel Levine	Community Services Bureau of Metropolitan New York New York, New York

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Mr. Boyd McDivitt	N.Y.C. Office of Probation New York City, New York
Mr. Jerome McElroy	N.Y. State Crime Control Planning Board New York, New York
Miss Jean Miller	Community Action Program (CAP) Office of Economic Opportunity Washington, D. C.
Mr. James Pierce	Commando I Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Mrs. Lucille Pinkett	Youth Safety Division Bureau of Labor Standards Department of Labor Washington, D. C.
Dr. Samuel Pisaro	Office of Education Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D. C.
Mr. William Resnick	Department of Legal Services Mobilization for Youth New York City, New York
Dr. Alex Rosen	Graduate School of Social Work New York University New York City, New York
Mr. Henry Saltzman	Public Education Association New York City, New York
Mr. Daniel Schreiber	Assistant Superintendent of Schools New York City, New York
Mr. John Wallace	N.Y.C. Office of Probation New York City, New York
Mr. Hank Walters	Commando I Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Mr. Robert Weber	National Council on Crime and Delinquency New York, New York
Miss Ernestine Welch	N.Y.C. Office of Probation New York City, New York

Staff, Center for Study of the Unemployed

Mr. Stanley Sadofsky
Dr. Russell Nixon
Mr. Michael Munk
Mrs. Constance Carr
Mrs. Lita Paniagua
Mr. Martin Birnbaum
Mrs. Linda Bailey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**	
	Stanley Sadofsky	7
	Eli Cohen	9
	Discussion	15
II	**SURVEY OF PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICERS, NEW YORK STATE**	
	Michael Munk	21
	Discussion· Research Methodology	25
III	**SHORT-RANGE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**	
	Job Corps	31
	Work-Study Programs	32
	Private Educational Alternatives	34
	Union and Business Involvement	38
	Neighborhood Youth Corps	38
	Girls' Problems	39
IV	**LONG-RANGE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**	
	Foreign Experience	41
	Compulsory School Attendance or Work	43
	Delinquency and Public Policy	47
	The Labor Market	49

I INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

MR. STANLEY SADOFSKY (Director, Center for Study of the Unemployed):

This Conference is a component part of a larger project funded by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Both in this Conference and in the project, we are primarily concerned with the special problems of youth who are on probation or on parole and who are between fourteen and sixteen years of age. Our focus on this age group is an outgrowth of our Center's activities in the field of work training and employment, in which we have conducted research studies, provided technical assistance, and have undertaken training of those who plan and deliver employment services to youth.

More particularly, however, our concern for these youth is a result of a conference on the employment problems of youthful probationers that we sponsored in conjunction with the New York City Office of Probation, in December of 1967.

It became clear during those sessions that for children under the age of sixteen, who are on probation or on parole, there are very few services that can by law, be delivered to them. We became aware, at the same time, of the many employment problems and other needs of this particular group of youth.

It became especially clear to us that employment is obviously not an alternative for them, since public policy does not permit entry into the labor force — at least legally — on a full-time basis until the age of sixteen.

In point of fact, the drift in our society today is toward a later age of entry into the labor market, simply because employers generally will not consider full-time employment for youth who are much younger than 18 years of age. The problem of employment for these youth is obviously related to existing public policies.

Public policy assumes that these youth are in school, since compulsory school attendance laws — although they vary from state to state — generally require that youth be in school at least until the age of sixteen. But unfortunately, many of the youngsters, who are on probation or parole, under the age of 16, are either not attending school, or are attending irregularly. In New York City, at least, they cannot easily obtain adequate training for skilled work since public vocational high schools have tended to set up over the last several years some rather difficult qualifications for entry, to the point where many of the youth who are on probation and on parole, and other disadvantaged youth, find it impossible to qualify.

In addition, we find that these youth are not eligible for enrollment in government-sponsored community work programs, such as the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps, again, simply because of their age. One

needs to be 16 years of age in order to be permitted to enroll in a community-based, government-sponsored work program.

Youth between 14 and 16 can enroll in the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps, provided that they are in the 9th grade; and, most important of all, provided that they are in school. We have reason to believe, by the way, that not too many probationers and parolees are getting into the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps.

These youth, also by virtue of their age, are not eligible for entry into the military services. Although they are a needy population, community services and organized programs for them are in the main lacking in resources, or are overcrowded, so that when such youth require medical or psychiatric or psychological attention of one kind or another, we find that these services are simply not available to them.

Consequently, the group that we are concerned with here is one which either has rejected school, or has been rejected by the schools. They are a group who are generally not gainfully employed, who find it very difficult to obtain work training, or vocational preparation, and supportive services.

I suppose one could find them hanging around in the streets of practically any ghetto area almost any hour of the day, doing nothing socially useful, priming themselves, perhaps, for their next encounter with the law and for incarceration. They seem to be without almost all needed institutional supports from the schools, from employment services; and, in many cases, unfortunately, from family life at the very time when, as adolescents, they are in great need of precisely such supports.

But these problems are not unique to those boys and girls under the age of 16 who are on probation and parole. In point of fact, they are applicable to a much broader population of youth.

We have, in the course of this project, estimated that there were 30,000 young people who were on probation or on parole in the State of New York in 1968. If one adds to that the much larger group of youth under 16 who are similarly not attending school with great regularity, who are not employed, who are in need of such services, and who almost at any time may find themselves in some kind of encounter with the law, then it becomes clear that we are dealing with a problem of very significant magnitude.

In the face of a problem of this size, the usual approach has been to stress the **educational** difficulties that these youth face. In this project, we have tried to stress the problems that these youth have in effecting a **transition from school to work.** The question of effecting a transition from school to work has recently been seen with greater urgency, although we have been talking about it in our field for many, many years. Within the last year an entire issue of **New Generation,** published by Mr. Eli Cohen's National Committee on Employment of Youth, was devoted to this problem. The 1968 Manpower Report of the President devoted a substantial section to it, and

in May of 1968, Princeton University held an impressive symposium that was addressed exclusively to analyses of the school-to-work transition on a national and international basis.

We have tried in our own exploratory project to attempt to put the problem of these youth into some kind of clear perspective, and to describe some of its major dimensions and some of the major needs that these youngsters have.

We have tried to examine some of the community-based services that are available for these youth. We have attempted to study the influence of public policy, and especially those policies that relate to compulsory school attendance laws and to child labor laws governing the age and other conditions of entry into the labor market.

We have attempted to relate these policies to the problems of delinquency on the assumption that public policy has an influence upon those social conditions which may lead to delinquent behavior on the part of youth. We then examined whether government policy is sufficiently flexible to permit the development of needed kinds of delinquency prevention and rehabilitation programs.

Finally, we are also concerned in this project with attempting to develop some recommendations and suggestions for modifications in public policy, where this seems to be necessary and appropriate.

Our keynote speaker, Mr. Eli Cohen, will identify some of the relationships between public policy and the school-to-work transition and its effect on delinquency. As a leading expert on these questions, Mr. Cohen will set the stage so that we can start our discussion of the issues from the same point of departure.

MR. ELI E. COHEN, Executive Secretary, National Committee on Employment of Youth:

Stan Sadofsky has sketched out very well what problems the average 14- and 15-year-old who is on probation or parole faces in our affluent society, potentially rich with many opportunities and many experiences, but actually limiting his options rather severely.

He certainly can't quit school to go to work — at least not legally. In fact, he can't work full time unless it is in the summer. He can't work part time during school hours unless he is fortunate enough to get into the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is now being cut back, or lucky enough to find an employer who is not in interstate commerce and who is willing to hire him. It is hard for him to work after school because there are not too many jobs for him. He is limited in the kinds of jobs he can get because he can't work in a factory and in so-called hazardous occupations. He could be too young to get into the vocational educational courses, and if he lives in New York City, he probably will find it difficult to pass the entrance examination that is given in most vocational high schools.

My own guess is that throughout the country there are about 50,000 youngsters under the age of 16 who should be in school but are not, and who are working illegally. This is suggested by studies such as one in New York City that turned up some four or five thousand in this category.

Actually we are beginning to reap the harvest of about three decades of a public policy which, while it attempts to protect our young people from hazards and exploitation, has prolonged their dependence and closed off many opportunities for their development. The best way to characterize the effect of this public policy is to read from a paragraph in the 1968 Manpower Report of the President:

> "The United States keeps larger portions of its children in school longer than any other nation. Yet, the unemployment rate among youth here is far higher than in any other industrial nation."

That paradox really sums up our problem. The richest and most highly developed nation, with the costliest system of education does the poorest job among the industrialized nations in moving its youngsters from school to jobs. **It is my thesis that, since the depression of the 1930's, except perhaps for the years of World War II, this country has had no use for the labor of children and youth, with the possible exception of agriculture. The goal of our public policy has been to keep them in school as long as possible and to postpone as long as possible their entry into the labor force.**

The fact is that employers do not need what they consider the marginal skills and labor of our young people. Nor are unions interested in youth working, in part because of concern about what this might do to wage scales and job opportunities for adults. The public, as a whole, has placed the value of formal education on such a high pedestal that it supports these policies.

Prior to the depression of the thirties, we didn't have such tender feelings about protecting our children and youth from employment. From the time that the nation started to get industrialized, during the latter part of the 19th Century, through the turn of the 20th Century, a period of heavy immigration from Europe, until the depression of the 1930's, we employed youngsters in the worst kinds of situations. We employed nine-year-olds to work ten, twelve or fourteen hours a day in mines and sweatshops. Some hardy souls tried to do something about it, and once in a while they were able to get a law passed, but consistently the Supreme Court declared the laws unconstitutional. So when the protection was really needed, it was not forthcoming.

It was not until the depression of the 1930's — when an estimated quarter of the population was unemployed — that we actually acted to protect children in employment. A major reason for that action was that we had a surplus of labor and we needed to reduce the working force.

This policy can be linked to the proposals for earlier retirement. Remove the young and old from the labor force, and obviously unemployment will

decline. Unemployment can be solved without creating more jobs by adopting public policies that reduce the number of people who look for work.

Even the exceptions, it seems to me, prove the rule. For example, in agriculture, a three-year-old youngster, in a state which has no laws regulating farm employment, legally could do farm labor during school vacation because there is no federal law regulating employment of children in agriculture when school is not in session. From time to time, efforts have been made to get the Congress to pass such a law, without success. Why do we let kids work in agriculture, which is the third most hazardous industry in the nation, and not in, let's say, an office, or a store, which are relatively free of hazards? Because in the field of agriculture we still need the labor of our children. It is an industry that has not mechanized enough yet, and there are not enough adults who will take farm jobs at the wages paid.

Let me point out another exception: The Fair Labor Standards Act prohibits youth under 16 years from working during school hours. Therefore, they cannot participate in the work-study programs which are now highly touted as being an answer to many problems. They have been praised as a major weapon in the fight against dropouts and as a way of providing vocational education in the employer's place of employment rather than in the school shop. But if they are to be effective in preventing dropouts, it does not make sense to limit eligibility to age 16 and over because the largest number of dropouts occur at age 16 when the youngster is able legally to leave school. Nevertheless, the Economic Opportunity Act was amended to permit youngsters to enroll in the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps in the 9th and 10th grades, many of whom are under 16 years of age, to be able to benefit from this work-study program during school hours. This is the only exception I am aware of, and it is made because it clearly prevents students from leaving school and entering the labor market.

Let me add one ironic footnote: In November, 1966, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor announced that it would no longer report, as part of its national statistics on employment and unemployment, the figures on 14- and 15-year-olds. They are reported every month in separate tables, but are not included in the national totals. There may be some perfectly valid reasons for doing this, but I cannot help connecting it with a climate that does not want young teenagers to work.

On the surface, the policy of keeping youth in school and off the labor market sounds like a reasonable and desirable policy. Certainly, the more highly educated our population is, everything else being equal, the better off our country will be economically, culturally, and socially. There is also a direct correlation between employment and education — the more highly educated get the better jobs at better pay. Certainly our public policy has worked by encouraging more youth to stay in school longer. 94 per cent of the 14- through 17-year-olds in this country are in school, compared to a range of 55 per cent to 65 per cent in Europe. Since World War II ten per

cent fewer of this age group are participating in the labor force in the U.S. During this same period, however, the ratio between the rate of youth unemployment and the rate of adult unemployment has risen. In 1935 the rate of youth unemployment was one and a half times that of adults; by 1948 it had moved up to two and a half times that of adults; by 1963 to three times; and by 1967, three and a half times that of the rate of adults. While the overall rate of unemployment has been declining, the comparative rate of unemployment of young people has gone up.

Therefore, our public policy is resulting in more young people staying in school longer while making it harder for them to get jobs.

But is it really a good policy? Does it do what it should do? Does longer school attendance really prepare our young people for the labor market? Does it prepare them for life? Does it afford them the kind of experiences for growth and self-development that every adolescent needs as he moves into adulthood? The answers are not clear-cut. School may be fine for the vast majority of young people who get along well and fit into the system, but even for this group there is reason to raise questions. When dependency is prolonged into late adolescence, the opportunities for independence are curtailed. When even such activities as chores around the household are becoming a thing of the past, one wonders whether youth are getting the full opportunity to grow up, to explore and to find themselves, to develop vocational interests, and to benefit from the experiences of summer work and after-school employment.

Most people assume that going to school is in and of itself good. A growing group of critics are beginning to raise doubts. One of the foremost of these is the Dean of the College of Education at the University of Illinois, Rupert Evans, who is saying publicly **that the purpose of school is to prepare for more schooling.** He does not say it is to educate. He does not say it is to prepare for work or to stimulate growth and self-development. He does say it is to prepare for more schooling: To pass tests better; to get along better in the classroom with the teacher; and to be able better to handle the next higher level of school. Evans parenthetically says that the only real vocational training that takes place in the classroom is at the graduate school level.

Others are questioning the traditional value of an education for work. Other than the obvious basics, like reading, writing and computation, they are saying that education provides a credential rather than a skill. Employers, uncertain of their ability to determine who is really qualified, use diplomas and degrees as an easy way of selecting employees. The very act of completing one's education, whether high school or college, somehow demonstrates a capacity to work.

Regardless of how one feels about these criticisms, there is little doubt that for certain youngsters — especially dropouts — the schools are truly

dysfunctional, and staying in school for the sake of schooling is meaningless if not indeed destructive.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is another manifestation of our "postponement" policy. There is an aging vat theory that goes like this: Since younger kids can't get jobs anyhow, why don't we put the 16- and 17-year-olds into the Neighborhood Youth Corps program until they get old enough, say 18, 19 or 20, when, just because they are older, they will be employed?

In this case, the Neighborhood Youth Corps becomes another vehicle for keeping them off the labor market. We can't keep them in school so we keep them in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Another example is the development of the community or junior colleges, which are attempting to take over vocational education from the secondary schools. Ostensibly the community college is training at the technician level, but there are many instances where they are training in the same skills as the high schools. If we get the youngsters to take that training at the community college rather than high school level, they will stay in school two years longer and are postponing their entry into the job market to that extent.

Another variation on the same theme is the heavy support for a compulsory 18-year school-leaving law.

My analysis of public policy would be incomplete if it did not also indicate some of the forces opposed to lengthening school and postponing work. Among these are:

Segregationists in the Southern states who, following the Supreme Court decision on desegregation of schools, succeeded in repealing the state compulsory education laws to avoid sending their children to desegregated schools.

Educators who would like to remove from their classrooms the "uneducables" and the troublemakers who disrupt the education of the youngsters who are able and willing to learn.

Persons concerned with juvenile delinquency — judges and probation and parole officers — who have for at least ten years been insisting on some break in our present pattern of public policy in order to better meet the needs of youth in trouble.

Probably the most significant force is reflected in the drive initiated by the civil rights movement to employ minority group members. It resulted in the organization of the National Alliance for Businessmen and the JOBS program of the federal government. It represented a real breakthrough in persuading employers to change rigid hiring requirements by accepting for employment persons without high school diplomas and with police records while giving up the use of formal tests. The fortuitous combination of manpower shortages and the fear of unrest may possibly signal the very beginning of a policy reversal.

What should be our future policy? It we are to change, there are two major alternatives: one is to raise the minimum school-leaving and employment

age; and the other is to reduce it. There is a third alternative embodying a more flexible arrangement between work and study. As a guide to the direction in which to go, I offer consideration of these factors:

(1) The quality and relevance of education. To raise the school-leaving age to 18 for youngsters who decide at age 14 to drop out of school at age 16 is simply consigning them to another two years of custodial care, unless the kind of education they get is basically changed.

(2) The availability and meaningfulness of work opportunities. It is easy to suggest that 14-year-olds go to work, but if they can't get jobs, or get only dead-end, menial jobs, they are no better off than if they stayed in school.

(3) The potential for using the experience — whether it be school and/or work — for growth and self-development. Simply moving from school into a job without providing, for example, the kind of supervision needed, does little good.

(4) Re-examination of the protection issue — safety and hazardous occupations. Are the hazardous employment restrictions another way of keeping kids out of the job market? Can we identify those occupations that are really hazardous for 14, 15, 16 and 17-year-olds?

In one sense what is required is a balance between the need to protect youth from exploitation and physical harm, and the need to provide them with maximum opportunities for education, growth and experience. In another sense, the real issue is not school-leaving age but how to improve the quality of school and work.

What, then, should be the strategies for enriching work experience opportunities for youth? The first and obvious alternative is to try to persuade employers and unions to voluntarily reverse their position on the employment of youth. This will entail providing some kind of incentive. The Nixon administration probably will take this route and seems to be moving in the direction of lowering the minimum wage as an inducement for employers to hire youth. I am not optimistic that this is acceptable or will really work.

A second approach would be to exploit more fully the present breakthrough as reflected in the JOBS program. This would mean an acceleration in changing hiring requirements to open more job doors to greater numbers of disadvantaged youth. The danger here is that efforts to combat inflation might cool off the economy to the point where lay-offs will replace new hiring.

A third strategy is to expand the quantity and quality of job opportunities for youth to eliminate the necessity for keeping them off. Instead of worrying about what kinds of jobs young people are fitted for, we can focus on what kinds of job experiences the youngsters need in order to develop themselves.

A fourth approach involves changing the institutions with which the youngsters are in contact. It means making the schools less dysfunctional. It could mean creating new institutions which may be neither traditional

school nor work, as we originally hoped that the Job Corps, for example, might have become had it developed in a somewhat different way.

And finally, we have the alternative of making a major change in our public policy on the transition from school to work, which establishes artificial boundaries between school and work and play. Instead I recommend a dynamic flexibility between school and work in which entry and re-entry in either is facilitated.

Such an approach will eliminate the drop-out problem. It might relieve some of the tensions around the military draft problem for youngsters fearful of leaving, but above all, it simply makes sense. What difference does it make whether one writes an essay for pay at work, for credit at school, or for pleasure during leisure time?

Let me close with some observations about the relationship of all of this to the delinquent youngster on probation or parole. Obviously, he has a harder time in this transition from school to work than most other youngsters. But does exclusion from work and prolonged dependence while staying in school have a direct effect on his delinquency? We don't know. There is really no hard evidence. Such data as I have seen are contradictory. More study is needed, especially into the causes of the different types of delinquencies.

We can speculate that keeping some kids in school, in a situation which for them is untenable, does create restlessness and resentment. This can be healthy if they have constructive outlets for their discontent. But, if they commit acts society has judged unlawful, they become vulnerable to being charged with delinquency. Truants, for example, are disobeying the law, regardless of the provocation. The point is that we encourage an antisocial reaction by keeping some in school long after they have stopped participating.

There is a broader issue that all youth face in our society today — an identity conflict. It involves discovering one's self as an individual in an automated society. The protests and antisocial activity by young people represent in part rebellion to being an "IBM card."

The relevance, then, to delinquency is the effect of our public policies on youngsters and the difficulties they place in their path. More flexible policies that deal differently with different situations can make life more livable for all young people and provide them with the needed opportunities for growth and development in a difficult world.

DISCUSSION

MR. GEORGE KELLING (University of Wisconsin):

I think you showed that the schools function within our society to give merit badges, and at various points, stamp them on our heads. But I think the schools function too in identifying particular groups as bad or good,

and this gets me to the one point where I thought you were dead wrong: You said that we don't know about the relationship of education and dropping out to delinquency. In the state of Wisconsin, 18 is the age at which a kid may leave school, so that if he drops out at 16, 17, or earlier, he is, in point of fact, a delinquent. Thus, in this respect there is a one to one relationship between drop-out and truancy and delinquency. In many respects, the schools become delinquency-creating institutions.

MR. COHEN: My point was that I have yet to see conclusive evidence that if you sent the youngster off to a work program, or if you gave him special kinds of education, that you could prevent his becoming a delinquent. If we changed our public policies on compulsory school attendance and child labor, do we have any assurance this would have a direct effect on the incidence of delinquency?

In this connection, I have just learned that the number of referrals to the courts in New York City rises sharply while school is in session and declines when school is not in session. The explanation for this was the same stigmatizing that you are talking about: the youngster has gotten the label, the teacher pulls him out and sends him down to the principal's office, and then to the courts, and so on and so forth.

MR. JOHN WALLACE (New York Probation Department):

There has been a suggestion in the current Crime Commission report, and in a number of other papers, that the Juvenile Courts should define delinquency only as adult criminal behavior.

In other words, much of delinquency is child-oriented behavior. Ohio, I think, was one of the states that achieved a startling drop in its delinquency figure by taking out the kids below fourteen years of age and putting them in a separate category.

I share the kind of concern that has been expressed. Why should truancy be a subject of jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court?

MISS PAMELA LEVIN (Citizens Committee for Children):

We visited the New York City Juvenile Detention Center at Spofford during the teachers' strike, when most schools were closed, in the month of October, when intake at the center is usually at its peak, and they had their lowest register in a long, long time, and we can all draw implications from that.

However, I wanted to ask you to expand your observations about the work-study program.

MR. COHEN: There is a growing and respectable body of opinion, not yet backed up with facts, that work-study programs represent a new form of education that has two kinds of values.

First, work-study makes school more real to the youngster who is not oriented toward school because he is faced, if he has the opportunity to

work, with the prospect of dealing with something concrete. He gets paid, and has opportunities for learning in a less abstract, possibly non-verbal way. It is kind of an extension of a shop course, except that it has a good deal more reality and a payoff in terms of a salary.

This is the rationale behind the Neighborhood Youth Corps which says if we can enrich the school program with a work experience which gets integrated with the curriculum, this can get drop-outs back on to the track in school and get them to complete the highest grade they are capable of attaining. The problem under the law, a responsibility of the Secretary of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act, is that he has ruled that you have to be 16 to be able to work during school hours. Therefore, the opportunity for N.Y.C. out-of-school program is closed off to the younger kids under 16, and since the drop-out rate jumps at age 16, you foreclose the possibility for the youngster under 16 getting back on the track.

The Secretary of Labor was ready to issue an order last year, I understand, to permit youth below 16 to enter the N.Y.C. out-of-school program, but I gather the labor movement didn't like this and was able to block the order. Actually, in the State of New York, it is possible to run work-study programs for youth under the age of 16. The Board of Education has done it on a number of occasions, because under the law, if you label work-study as an educational program rather than a work program, it is possible to enroll youth under 16, even if they are paid.

I suspect, however, if we had more than a handful of projects of this sort at any time, it might raise all kinds of questions about interpretation of the compulsory attendance law and eliminate this "loophole."

Another part of this question is that, since 1963, when we passed a new vocational educational act, we said that one of the ways to provide vocational education is to do it right in the employer's place of business — in the store — in the office — in the factory. It's even better than setting up a lot of expensive shops in the schools. But the 1963 Act had money for this purpose, and although the 1968 amendments of the Vocational Educational Act re-enforced this point, I think the Bureau of the Budget cut out all the money to support this kind of program.

So, if you can use the work experience as a way of developing skills, as a way of enriching education and preventing drop-outs, then what we need to do is to make it available at a younger age, and the problem is that our public policy is counter to making this available. A year or two ago, when the Secretary of Labor was seriously considering doing something about it, he got no support, and being in the political arena, he has very limited options If he doesn't have support on certain issues.

MR. SADOFSKY: To reflect on one of the issues Eli mentioned in his presentation on the long-term desirability of breaking down linear relationship and barriers between school and work, I wonder whether there is any

experience, either in the cooperative education programs or in the institutional training programs, or in the Neighborhood Youth Corps which might help us to assess whether, if such traditional compartmentalization between school and work was eliminated, it would in fact produce better education and individuals who are better prepared to work.

MRS. EDWARD FIRST (Public Education Association):

In more cases than not, I think many of us would believe that the school system failed them by making truancy an offense. It seems to me that this is where we ought to be placing a great deal more of our attention, getting them out of the bag of the school system and offering them an alternative instead of penalizing them for the failures of the school system, and trying to put them into a work situation because the school situation can't meet their needs or something of that sort.

MR. JAMES PIERCE (Milwaukee Commando I):

When a cat gets out of the institution — take a cat who's a welder. When he gets back on the street, don't talk to him about going back to junior high school. Try to get him into the welding field, because put him back in the school and he'll mess up.

MISS ERNESTINE WELCH (N. Y. Office of Probation):

But can you get him into welding?

MR. HANK WALTERS (Milwaukee Commando I):

Yes, where we've got kids going to school half-a-day. The kid gets out of school at twelve o'clock, and with the okay of the principal and parents, he works a full eight-hour job in the plant.

We're talking about the kids who are 15 and 16. He is a state certified welder, or certified mechanic.

MR. HAROLD DANCE (U.S. Dept. of Labor, Neighborhood Youth Corps):

Let's talk about this whole problem of the 14 and 15 year olds and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. My good friend Eli indicated that we are a holding tank for these kids. If we are, then to want to lower the age levels of the out-of-school program to 14 and 15, means that we will continue to be a holding tank but we will get them younger and hold them longer.

We want to get involved with these younger kids, so we'll say okay, we'll get 16 and 17 year-olds in our out-of-school program and give it a try. And do you know what happens? We got calls from about 25 Congressmen from 11 states with compulsory school age laws that ranged from 17 to 18, and where they were 18 they said: "we won't even have an out-of-

school program if only 16 and 17 are eligible." Now, can you imagine what going down to 14 and 15 will do?

And never forget the political ramifications that are involved in any kind of a social change that you want to try to make in order to get a place for the 14's, 15's, 16's, who, to most people, are not very important.

MR. ROBERT WEBER (National Council on Crime Control and Delinquency): Implicit in Mr. Cohen's comments was that our existing public policy in this area, was the result of economic policies and economic structures. If that is true, then it seems rather silly of us to sit here and talk about changes in public policy without cognizance of the economic structure and economic policies which affect public policy in the area that we are discussing here with juveniles.

MRS. LUCILLE PINKETT (Youth Safety Division, U.S. Dept. of Labor):

I should like to bring up another problem in the Secretary of Labor's responsibility in setting forth work standards for 14 and 15 yea. olds. The Secretary has the authority to let 14 and 15 year olds work, if he determines that the employment will not be detrimental to their health and well being and will not interfere with their schooling.

However, as I hear of the programs you are discussing, such as in Milwaukee, it seems that the federal law is not being enforced, because as it now stands 14 and 15 year olds **may not work during school hours under any circumstances**, except when they are in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

In addition, I think we have some illegal employment going on, and instead of having dual standards, I think we have multi-standards. We would hope to get some advice as to how you can help us to amend the laws which permit this situation to exist.

I think that we need to know whether or not the work-study programs are going to make education more relevant to the individual, and will provide the youngster of this age group with a career exploration opportunity and not just a crash program to meet the immediate need. I don't think I can stress too much the fact that when we talk about this question, it would help me to know which age group we are talking about, because the 14 and 15 year old working in interstate commerce is illegal.

I might add that I am not in the enforcement area, however, but we are interested. One of the things that has been proposed was that students would be able to work in school in work experience programs under several relaxations that were proposed, but we have very little information about these programs. I think that the people who are running the programs are afraid to tell us about them for fear that the next thing you know the enforcement people will come around. (Laughter)

MR. ARTHUR GOLDEN (Community Services Bureau, N.Y.C.):

We deal with all of the training schools in New York State, which means our children have been institutionalized, are out on parole. My role as an employment liaison and guidance coordinator is operating within the framework of the law and ensuring that the employment is legal.

I am saying there is a need for putting 14 and 15 year old kids into legitimate employment, but where it is correlated with what is being done in school.

DR. RUSSELL NIXON (Center for Study of the Unemployed):

I want to suggest that there is an enormous variation amongst the individuals in the age group of 14 and 15. We probably make a mistake if we assume that everybody that is fourteen is the same as everybody else at fourteen, and so on. I suspect you will find big physical and psychological differences as well as different levels of maturity. It was almost like a dramatic prelude to this workshop to read last week the sad story about the fifteen-year-old boy killed with the Marines in Vietnam, who enlisted at the age of fourteen, and got away with it. He evidently met all the tests and requirements. While that boy might not be typical of fourteen and fifteen year olds, I suspect that there is a very large proportion of fourteen and fifteen year olds who are as mature as he was. And it does suggest that following this absolutely rigid chronological set of approaches in this area is dysfunctional and leads to a lot of difficulties, and I would suggest from a policy point of view we might think a lot more about flexibility.

MR. MICHAEL MUNK (Center for Study of the Unemployed):

We talk about the effects of public policy, the political influences that go into public policy, and the fact that these, as Mr. Weber suggested, express a basic economic need of our system.

We say that economic policy and the changing structure of the labor market is reflected in laws of school compulsory attendance and child labor. We say the kids are frustrated with institutions, that they want to change them, that they want to have an important role in deciding the policies that affect their lives. We see these demands as consequences of these public policies. From that perspective, our public policies regulating the transition from school to work can be described as oppressive policies designed, as Mr. Cohen said, basically to keep kids out of the labor market for the longest period of time possible in order to ensure employers of what they consider to be the most productive workers that they can possibly hire in their factories and offices.

On the treatment and prevention of delinquency, we can see that policy reflected in this particular way. The parole and probation officers are forced to keep kids who are under 16 in school. We have been told this many times over: They don't have really any major alternative for rehabilitation. However, after 16 they do. Now they can put him to work.

II SURVEY OF PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICERS, NEW YORK STATE

MR. MICHAEL MUNK:

There was a good deal of discussion this morning about the lack of adequate data and information, so aside from confirming that fact, I am going to try to present some of the more or less hard information on this target population that we have talked about, the 14 and 15 year old parolees and probationers.

Part of our project has been to conduct a survey of those who are perhaps the closest in a day-to-day relationship, as representatives of public policy, with this age group. I refer, of course, to probation officers assigned to the Juvenile Courts in New York State, and the youth parole workers assigned to their respective functions in the same state.

We distributed 225 questionnaires, and received a total of 140 completed ones. These reported on a sample of over 6,000 youth on probation and parole in the State, out of an estimated total of approximately 11,500, who are under that form of supervision in the community on any given day of the year.

Before going into some of the highlights of the survey, I'll try to put the problem in a national perspective. We do have some data on this age group, and we do know a little about its characteristics on a national level. We are concentrating on the age group 14-16 primarily because it might reflect more strongly than any other age group the problems that youth confront in making the transition from school to work, because most of the states that require full-time school attendance during the day through 16 also restrict the entry of youth into labor force before that age. This seems to suggest that if there are casual factors relating delinquency to the maturation process of youth generally, they will probably be reflected by this age group, 14 to 15, more strongly and more dramatically than by any other.

According to 1968 Department of Labor figures, there are 7.7 million youth in this age group, of whom some 94 per cent are formally enrolled in schools. This is the highest proportion of any country in the world. Nevertheless, even the official statistics show that there are some 200,000 youth in this age group not now enrolled in school. Why they are not enrolled, and whether they are legally not enrolled, has not been adequately explained.

We also heard that the 14 or 15 year olds are, as of two years ago, no longer included in the official Census Bureau and Department of Labor definition of labor force. However, if they were included, approximately 1.1 million of them would now be counted as part of the labor force. Of those, approximately 900,000 have jobs (almost all of which are part-time) and approximately 200,000 are unemployed and looking for work. Of the 900,000 who are employed, a significant proportion, 15 per cent, are working in agriculture.

Again, to repeat what Mr. Cohen said earlier, a paradox is suggested by the fact that although we keep a larger proportion of our youth in school for a longer period of time than any industrialized country, we also find a higher proportion of unemployment among these youth than in any other industrialized country. This rate, at the end of last year, shows that white youth 14 and 15 have an unemployment rate of 12 per cent; among black males, 24.8 per cent; and among black females, 32 per cent. This is three, four, five times higher than other industrialized countries, which do not normally keep youth in school beyond 15 years old.

The link with delinquency which we began to discuss this morning is something that is indeed very elusive.

U.S. Justice Department overall figures show that the 15 to 17 age group has the highest proportion of arrests. Approximately 15 per cent of all the arrests reported in the United States in 1967-68 judiciary year were of youth in this age category.

More locally, it is also the group that shows the highest rate of increase of arrests in New York City. The rate for the 14 to 16 year olds, according to Mayor Lindsay's Task Force report issued in May, 1969, has gone up 13 per cent over the last year. They are required to go to school. They are not permitted to work. At the same time, their arrest rate is among the highest of any age group.

So this suggests that perhaps the lack of alternatives — the compulsion to attend a school which many reject, or which rejects many, the inability to work in the kind of employment that they seek — may be contributing factors to their delinquent behavior as legally defined, as well as to the social and political protests that many of them are involved in today.

I will now move on to New York State where we focused our survey and study. According to the State Division for Youth, just about 10 per cent of the national total of 7.7 million youth 14 and 15 years old are in New York State; about 250,000 of these are in New York City. The latest total school enrollment of this age group according to the N. Y. Board of Education, however, was only 178,000. We have some discrepancy, then, between the total population of this age group and the total enrolled in school, although we don't know whether this is the result of different statistical estimates or whether, indeed, a large proportion of youth in this age group are in fact not enrolled in New York City Schools.

The Board of Education's Bureau of Attendance handles approximately a quarter of a million referrals every year through a staff of over 400 attendance teachers. We have found that the 14 or 15 year age group in New York City has the highest rate of truancy reported for any age group. An estimated 175,000 cases of the total might be termed "problem children" in their school attendance and behavior generally, but finances allow the Bureau to offer only 3500 of them the intensive treatment that they require. These 3500 presumably reflect the proportion of major problems

with regard to behavior and attendance, and almost 40 per cent of them are 14 and 15 years old. About 1,000 children, many of whom are in this age group, are referred to courts each year on truancy petitions.

As another kind of general observation on why this age group might be singled out, we learned that with regard to intensive treatment, better results were obtained working with youth who were below the age of 14. Apparently, remedial education, counseling, group work, casework, and so on, seemed to be more effective with younger children; and, after the age of 14, the problems become less tractable to traditional kinds of casework. This is an impression, really, not a finding, but it was echoed in our visits upstate to probation and parole officers. I was told several different times in Rochester and Buffalo, without any statistical evidence, that something seems to happen to kids around the age of 14. They become more independent. They are more aggressive, somewhat less subject to control, and so on.

Now I would like to turn with this kind of introduction on the dimensions of the problem to the factual findings of our survey.

Taking our sample of over 6,000 parolees and probationers together, the largest single age group was 14 to 15, but considerably higher for probationers than parolees, and I guess we can interpret this as a consequence of the fact that parolees, who were adjudicated before they were 16, were carried over on supervision past the age of 16. The 45 per cent who are in this age group is a smaller proportion than of the total number of JD and PINS cases disposed of by Juvenile Courts in New York State for the last judiciary year. Of those 20,000 cases, approximately 60 per cent were of youth 14 to 15 years old. One possible interpretation of this variation may be that a larger proportion of the 14 to 15 year group was disposed of without adjudication.

One of the more important findings was the distinction between the characteristics of parolees and probationers in New York City and those in the rest of the State. The distinction was rather dramatic, in fact: 75% of the youth in New York City, 14 to 15 years old, on parole and probation, are black and Puerto Rican. Outside of New York City over 65% are white. Inside of New York City, almost 60 per cent of them are from families receiving welfare assistance, another 30% are from "poor" families and approximately 66 per cent are not living with their natural parents. Outside the city, the probation and parole officers classified 41% as from "not poor" families, and less than 40% on welfare, and over 57% lived with both natural parents.

The differences in social background between the city and upstate probationers and parolees of this age group should be considered when planning new approaches to juvenile delinquency problems on a state-wide level, as I understand is to be done over the coming year, in accordance with current legislation.

We were, of course, most interested in what the youth in the sample were doing with their time. Basically, we asked parole officers whether, to the best of their knowledge, the youth under their supervision are attending school, and if so, whether on a regular or irregular basis, and whether or not any of them were working, legally or illegally.

What we found confirms much of the discussion this morning: the proportion of 14-15 year old youth in this group who were attending school irregularly or not at all is 42.5 per cent across the state, compared with only 40.3 per cent whom the supervisory offices believed to be attending regularly (school attendance of 17.1 per cent was not known). The proportion in New York City is higher, although not all that much higher than the rest of New York. It is 33 per cent irregularly on the statewide average; 37 per cent irregularly in New York City; 9.8 per cent not attending at all throughout the State; and 12 per cent in New York City.

When we get to sub groups, such as probationers in Brooklyn, the number of youth who rejected school, by attending irregularly or not at all, reached 57 per cent. That is surely a significant finding, since all these youth are required by law to be attending school on a regular basis.

When we asked the parole and probation officers what proportion of the youth in their case loads had been originally adjudicated because of truancy or school-related offenses — and by this is meant various kinds of misbehavior at school — we found in the original adjudication that for 53 per cent of the probationers and parolees this was the reason.

Approximately 20 per cent of PINS cases statewide were adjudicated for truancy alone.

The finding is significant because it suggests that truancy petitions by themselves do not give an accurate indication of the contribution of compulsory education laws to delinquency statistics. If youths are arrested for a wider variety of other school-related offenses than school attendance alone, then the relation between public policy and delinquency becomes a little more complex than the one to one relationship with truancy we began to suggest earlier.

In New York City, for example, there have been mass expulsions this year from the schools, some of which were of youth below the age of 16, although the Board of Education and the principals did not reveal this originally and maintained all youth had been over 16 who were expelled. We do have more signs of organized protests in the schools that show up as delinquency statistics, and much of it has to do with the quality of education that is made available to the youth.

Now, if in New York City — let's take the more dramatic example — the majority of 14-15 parolees and probationers who should be attending school regularly in this age group are not, what does it mean that they are doing? Several people told us this morning that they were really doing nothing, and our survey in general tends to confirm this. We found that

across the state as a whole, only 6 per cent of the youth on parole or probation, 14 to 15, had part-time employment; and less than 1 per cent had full-time employment, which we presume to be illegal. We also found that only 65 of the parolees and probationers, less than 3 per cent, were enrolled in the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is a rather minor proportion. At the same time, less than 10 per cent were enrolled in vocational high schools or vocational courses in regular high schools.

The conclusion, therefore, is that if they are not working, if they are not going to school, at least regularly, what they do with their time is generally not sanctioned by current public policies.

In the other half of our questionnaires for the parole and probation officers, we asked them, as people who are spending full time dealing with this group of youth on a day-to-day basis, their perceptions of what the major needs of the youth under their supervision are, and how effective are the services that they now have available to them. Personal needs were ranked first. This was true in New York City and upstate. Overwhelmingly, the problems of individual adjustment, self-image, peer relationships, and other responses which we grouped generally under the area of personal needs, were considered most important. Again, this was the perception of the parole and probation officers of what the youth think they need. Second was employment, and third was education.

Fourth was improved family relations or strengthened family relationships, family structures. But the most important were (1) personal needs and (2) employment: These accounted for approximately three-quarters of the responses on the most important needs of the 14-15 parolees and probationers in the case loads of the offices.

Also significant was the fact that when we asked the officers whether the youth under their supervision generally regarded school positively or negatively, we found that only 25 per cent of the officers reported that their youth had a positive attitude toward the school they were attending. But about 40 per cent reported that the same youth had a positive attitude toward education in general.

DISCUSSION: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

MISS JEAN MILLER (Office of Economic Opportunity Youth Program, CAP): Was this the impression of the probation officers?

MR. MUNK: Yes.

MISS MILLER: So you had no control over their answers, no hint that that was the expected answer from them?

MR. MUNK: None at all. These were anonymous questionnaires.

MR. WALTERS: Who chose the youth you interviewed?

MR. MUNK: The probation office.

MR. WALTERS: That's what I figured. As a university on a research survey, couldn't you enter the institutions themselves? What I am saying is,

the parole or probation officer can pick a good boy, for instance, and say, "Look, we got this cat who wants to interview you, and we want you to do the thing and sweeten it up," and stuff like that. If you are going to do a research job and expect for it to be effective, and if you are trying to find out real facts and get really nitty gritty things, you have got to get to the real people to do it right.

MR. SADOFSKY: We were not funded to do a research study. We were attempting to reflect in this project the adequacy of public policies in relation to youth who are under the age of 16. We have about seven to eight months to complete this whole project and we have very modest funding — less than three people on this job.

What we have attempted to do is kind of an exploratory study using probation and parole officers and their perceptions simply because as a group they were closest to the target population.

After all, one could make an argument for the bias in anybody's perception of these kids. I am afraid that perhaps we have romanticized the conception of the practitioner who likes to believe that the kids are only telling the truth to him and not to the official probation or parole officer, but we have no confirmation of this, either.

Certainly, if kids are biased in their responses to probation and parole officers, to research people, then conceivably they may be biased even in response to the practitioner who is there to provide them with some service.

Consequently, unless you are prepared to engage in a very profound, rather elaborate research effort, probably going beyond the conventional research designs that we have available to us today, and unless you are prepared to throw in considerable resources and considerable time, there are severe limitations as to what we can do.

MR. GOLDEN: One thing we know is when these kids are responding to these things, they are most honest.

MR. WALTERS: Man! Man, I never! Look, I've been in myself — I'm a parolee and probationer, too, man, so I definitely can't buy that. Wow! Man!

MR. KELLING: If you are going to select out kids that are going to take a particular line, it's not that they won't speak free, it's that the kid they select to speak will say what they like.

MR. WINTON AHLSTROM (Institute for Community Studies):

Well, in our case we didn't select them. We had 400 kids and we interviewed all of them. We found the majority of them did want to belong. They had positive feelings, not toward school but as individuals within the system. They had problems with particular teachers, but they really wanted to really belong, and had positive feeling for wanting to be a part of this.

MR. WALTERS: When we did the same research a year ago, we found that the majority of students who don't want to go to school are cats that have hang-ups with the school system.

MR. PETER DOMIANO (Youth Parole Supervisor):

I should like to suggest that the selection of the institutional population for interview purposes is not necessarily more valid, because I worked in the institutions and I have worked in after-care, and it seems to me that one can see quite readily that the boy or girl within the institution is going to give the desired response more readily because he's got parole hanging, and this is not true in after-care, so I think the random sample is valid.

MR. KELLING: I have been a probation officer, and a parole agent, and have done institution work, and now am a consultant for Commandoes in their project, and am also involved in some survey research at the present time. It has been a fascinating thing to me to listen to what the kids say to their parole agents and what they say to the Commandoes, and what they say to survey researchers, and the use of the put-on with the probation officers and the researchers is absolutely fantastic. I must tell you, I personally at this point have very little reliance upon any opinion that goes through the filter of the probation officer.

MR. MUNK: On this issue of our sample, I think it is perfectly clear that we are talking now about the perceptions of parole and probation officers. We are not saying that this is in fact what the kids under their supervision believe. We are dealing here with an issue of public policy. Under present de facto standards of our system of juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment, public policy assigns probation and parole officers to the major role of supervising these kids. They are the personal expression of public policy with regard to the youth that we are talking about. If they are inadequate, then it is an expression of public policy, but I also wonder whether or not our data would indeed be different if we did ask kids what they are doing with their time.

We are finding in effect what many of you are saying, that the kids are rejecting the schools that are now available to them and they are restricted in the kind of employment that they are able to get, and we are really showing here, it seems to me, a gap in public policy.

At any rate, work and work-training was considered by the officers to be the major need, according to their perception of how the youth felt, but they themselves, however, had different perceptions. They themselves thought that staying in school was more important.

We also asked parole and probation officers to react to the notion that compulsory education, child labor, hazardous employment and other laws should be modified, eliminated, or whether they had some other suggestions. Interestingly enough, the majority of the officers (approximately 60 per cent across the state) favored the downward modification of compulsory education laws. By "modification," they did not mean the elimination. They did seem to agree that more flexibility, at least, was required in that area. On the child labor laws, hazardous employment, working paper requirements, a bare plurality favored modification, but I think that the

findings there were less significant because the margins were much smaller, the responses were scattered considerably more. So we didn't have a real trend, aside from the opinions on compulsory school attendance laws.

We also learned that while work training and employment were considered a major aid for treating delinquency, they were not thought to be the most important need, according to about 80 per cent of the officers in the sample. Again, the earlier finding of personal needs dominated that response. They stressed individual counseling, better treatment facilities and more funds. With regard to their contact with other agencies and their estimates of possible gaps in service, we found as expected that the attendance and guidance bureaus of the public schools were cited most often, followed by psychiatric hospitals, drug addiction clinics, community job centers, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and public employment services in that order.

Among educational agencies the largest gaps in service were related to poor coordination. The lack of jobs was identified as the greatest gap for the vocational agencies, inadequate funds for medical agencies, while delays and inadequate physical facilities were most often cited with regard to counseling and psychiatric agencies.

I think that the most important finding in general was that these kids are not really being benefited in terms of vocational and educational help available to them. This has a significant implication for public policy and for the enforcement of the laws governing what society defines as acceptable behavior for this age group.

It seems to me that if we are not enforcing the laws we have on the books, this indicates a failure in those institutions which youth are required by law to attend or to be put into. It also shows a failure in providing sufficient alternatives, flexibility in public policy and so on.

And there is a suggestion in this data about the failure to provide viable opportunities for youth to make a transition from school to work: It suggests, at least, that changes in public policy might well reduce delinquency for this age group.

MR. JACOB KAUFMAN (Penn State University):

I fear that you can lower all the compulsory education laws from 16 to 14 and it won't make a damn bit of difference in delinquency. This is what concerns me. I am afraid a lot of energy will be put into changing public policy, and the problem will still be with us, and will be growing, because we haven't conducted a careful research on it.

MR. MUNK: I think the finding simply reflects the fact that there is a good deal of frustration expressed by the parole office with respect to having to enforce a law which youth under their supervision basically rejects.

I don't think that the implication of that is that compulsory education

laws ought to be reduced to 14. It seems to me the consequence of this kind of expressed frustration would be first of all a modification, not an elimination of compulsory education; the provision of alternatives; the exploration of alternative educational institutions, such as street academies, or other private, non-public schools; in other words, improvement of the institutions that they are forced to attend. I would read the survey as showing that right now it is an absence of viable alternatives for this age group that public policy has to confront, and not simply the fact that they are forced to remain in school. In fact, I would probably agree that if you simply eliminated or reduced the compulsory attendance laws you would have no effect on the way the kids behave, although it would have an effect on delinquency statistics considering the proportion of them are related to it.

MR. WEBER: I think that this information could be quite useful and helpful in the State of New York. My problem with it is that it is being used as a basis for consideration of public policy, which is national in implications, talking about Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, all national programs.

The State of New York is only one of about half-a-dozen states which defines juvenileness as ending at age 16. You would find a different picture of 14 and 15 year olds in other states.

I noted with amusement the figures on the solutions recommended by the officers' final paragraph. To me it is indicative of the need for a good training program for parole and probation officers for the State of New York if they think better counseling is going to give them good prevention and treatment of delinquency among 14 and 15 year olds. Their beliefs fly in the face of the facts.

MR. KELLING: When you advocate changing public policy and you don't talk to the people who are affected by such changes, I think you are winding up in the same old paternalistic bag that has got us in our present horrendous dilemma. I think that this survey purports to be something that it is not, and as a result the consequences are going to be tragic. I wish you could be getting at these kids who are most articulate, and who are going to be affected by this.

MRS. LEVIN: I haven't had too much experience with probationers or delinquents, but I have talked with lots of young people who may be predelinquent. They are in large measure the activists, the kids who have been participating in disruptions in the high schools, and the thing that they are screaming out for is to be heard — not just to have an audience, but to have somebody who will be responsive to what they are saying. Nobody is really listening, because the people in positions of authority have a standardized procedure that has been written down some place and it doesn't meet the needs and the demands and the urgencies of these young people.

MR. MARTIN BIRNBAUM (Center for Study of the Unemployed):

It would be important to know how these youngsters actually do spend

their time. We know that they are not in school. We know that they are not working. What are they doing? Because the very nature of what they do, would affect public policy. So a study like this suggests other studies.

MR. WALLACE: I was struck by the survey results that expressed the frustrations of the people who have to enforce the public policy.

We have only the expression of the frustration of the kids in the sense that they don't show up in school and they are on the illegal labor market, or they are in some type of non-school connected activity.

When you look at the Corrections System — this is the area where we have done the greatest amount of imposing a policy upon those employed in the field, and on the probationer or parolee, and giving neither group a chance to say what that policy ought to be.

MR. DANIEL SCHREIBER (N.Y.C. Board of Education):

We have youngsters who are now being discharged from institutions, or placed on probation by a Juvenile Court judge, and we have them back in society. We have then the psychological effect of their going back to the same institution, the school, in which they were failures, and in which their colleagues know that they were caught. Some want jobs. Some want to go back to school. Some don't want either one of these things. Some want the excitement of committing crimes. So, unless you can separate out your population and pinpoint what you want for them, you can't come up with a decent public policy.

MRS. CONSTANCE CARR (Center for Study of the Unemployed):

We came here to discuss public policy. Now, it seems that there is a tacit recognition that regardless of what the personal problems are, the system is creating, through institutional imbalance, some very specific personal deficits that maybe we as professionals can see almost more than we can understand what a kid will say to us, because we are going to listen to him from our perspective, and each one of us will interpret it almost as if he didn't say it. There are other systemic kinds of faults that we recognize by talking about public policy. We understand that when a kid talks about his family problems and says they're his personal problems — that these aren't his personal problem — those family problems are part of the system. So, let's get back to the system and what the institutional and legislative faults are.

III SHORT-RANGE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

MRS. CARR: Now we would like to explore with you some short-range policy recommendations. By this we mean measures that can be implemented quickly, to provide some measure of relief for the problems of youth who are on probation, on parole and under the age of 16 years. Basically, they represent little more than extensions of existing policies and existing programs.

MRS. FREIDA ALTES (Bureau of Attendance, N.Y.C. Board of Education):

I would like to talk about the Job Corps, because we have a new arrangement worked out in the Bureau of Attendance. Under our law and policy, you cannot leave school unless you actually have a job at age 16, (you can't leave without a job until 17 in New York City, although you can at 16 in the rest of the state) and many of our kids do not have jobs. We worked out a system that if they had histories of truancy and school failures, and were not going to stay in school, that even without a job they would be transferred to the Job Corps Program at 16 where they would be given some education and job training, and we would consider that the equivalent of an actual job for school-leaving purposes.

The difficulty was that the Job Corps placed them in camps away from the city, so we had very, very few kids who wanted to take advantage of this. They didn't want to leave home. So, I would say that if the Job Corps were more neighborhood-related, or city-related, they would have gotten more kids into the program under those flexible arrangements that we made, but it just didn't work out, and even if you reduced the age to 14 and 15 years old, these kids wouldn't leave home at all to take advantage of the Corps.

MR. SADOFSKY: I think there is a plan now being considered in Washington, which has received a great deal of publicity in the last couple of months, to locate many Job Corps Centers in and around the periphery of the ghetto neighborhood themselves.

MR. GOLDEN: Having visited the Job Corps sites that I feel are relevant to our children, I would oppose the Job Corps site per se for the 14 or the 15 year old boy, because I believe that this is when the children should be working out their family problems.

MR. SADOFSKY: I don't think anybody would like to see a breakup of the family as a consequence of this kind of a policy suggestion. We are not talking about taking the kid out of the home forever. In many cases, we are talking about a one-year effort at the age of 14, a one-year stay in the neighborhood Job Corps Center, and I doubt that this would be destructive to family relationships.

On the other hand, I can also think that in some instances this kind of separation may in fact be beneficial.

MRS. ALTES: I don't see it for the 14 and 15 year olds. I might see it for the 16 and over.

MR. BOYD McDIVITT (N.Y.C. Office of Probation):

Why not for the 14 and 15 year old who is having such a miserable experience with the traditional school program that he is so frustrated and can't stay in it and needs the different kind of educational experience?

MRS. ALTES: I am not sure the Job Corps is going to provide that kind of new and different and meaningful experience for him. I would rather see

some changes in the present educational set-up from the traditional so that we know that he is getting at least the minimum that would prepare him for life. The policy change that I would see is not for the 14 and 15 year old. For the 14 and 15 year olds, my feeling is that there have to be changes, innovative programs within the normal school set-up. There are a lot of things going on for small groups, for example, but I still feel that basically the youngster below 16 does need English, reading, spelling, and arithmetic in the regular school.

MR. HARRY DWORKIN (Children's Bureau, U.S. Dept. of HEW):

Would it be acceptable to you in the school system if they set it up as sort of a work-study thing, work one week, go to school the other week, and while they are going to work they get ten dollars a day expenses?

MRS. ALTES: I would say that a work-study program for some kids is very good, but you have to know the kids, and it is not going to be the answer for all 14 and 15 year olds who are not responding. You have to determine who your kids are that are going to go into this kind of program, and, secondly, you know it means modification of compulsory educational laws. I would go along with a cooperative program for 14 and 15 year olds, the kind of thing we are now doing in the high schools, only for a relatively small number of selected kids.

MR. AHLSTROM: In Kansas City we got around this problem of under 16 by including it as a work-study curriculum. Half of the day was spent in the classroom by kids under 15½, and half the day was spent in non-paid group work around the schools. This was within the curriculum of the school, and this was the first stage of the work.

This then moved into the second stage when the kids were 15½, and then we had coordinators, appointed by the school, seeking part-time, paid jobs for the kids. The jobs were "non-hazardous" jobs and quite limited.

The third stage had the boys moving out into full-time paid work, at the age of 17 or 18. And the program was to help them make this transition. It did not give a high school diploma, but a work certificate.

MR. MUNK: Was that project designed to reduce delinquency among this group of kids?

MR. AHLSTROM: Yes, but we have some hard data to show that in the initial stages our delinquency increased, and some evidence to show that this may have been due to a "contagion" factor from a number of maladjusted kids. Delinquency began to level off when the boys got into full-time employment after age 16, but, looking at the overall rates, it didn't show the decrease that we expected. However, we did find that when we had well organized summer work for them, there was a reduction in delinquency.

I said that in the initial stages of our work-study project, there was an increase of delinquency in our group. By the time they were 18, we were

able to identify five sub-groups of boys. One was work adaptive. They seemed to do real well, and work experience probably meant a great deal in terms of all the things we are talking about wanting to see in these kids. Another sub-group was school adaptive, and they were able to get a certificate and graduate. These kids, from what we have been able to determine now, needed a couple of years to mature, and the work experience gave them that chance.

Another group was very erratic. They would work at times but also got into trouble. They didn't seem to crystalize into any kind of group with certain kinds of characteristics, except that they did have "bad"-"good" kinds of behavior. Another sub-group was marginal, and didn't appear to enjoy school or work.

The characteristics of these seriously maladjusted kids, looking at their behavior in school and work and elementary grade school, were "bad" all the way through, and our program didn't reach them. They were socially maladjusted kids as far as the criteria we used: in 7th grade (13-14 year old) they were already all below average in achievement; average and below in terms of I.Q., and now they were graded by their peers and their teachers as the most aggressive kids.

MR. SADOFSKY: Were you able to draw any implications from this typology for educational institutions, or for job training, or for employment?

MR. AHLSTROM: We found that boys who really adapted to work were not too different from socially maladjusted boys except that their problems did not begin until later in their adolescence.

This obviously means the work experience, as such, changing the age limit to 14, getting kids jobs, and so on, is not going to be enough to reduce delinquency. We are going to have to identify kids who are not getting along in school but who haven't developed anti-social attitudes yet. I think this group will be helped by giving them opportunities for work.

MR. SADOFSKY: It seems to me one of the things that Mr. Ahlstrom is suggesting as a result of a study, is that on the continuum of needs and capabilities, there are some for whom other kinds of needs take a higher priority than the questions of education and the question of work, or the transition between the two. These are the kids, you are saying, who will not make it either in school or work.

Consequently, some other program altogether might be necessary, and my own guess would be that perhaps we are talking here about 20 per cent of the population, a comparatively small number of kids, who are so badly damaged that they cannot profit either from work or from education. Nevertheless, I think that from a policy point of view, it is probably necessary to recognize that the flexibility we require in our approach to this problem suggests that not in every case will there be either an educational or a workable work alternative appropriate for the needs of youth.

MR. WALTERS: In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, we have a project called Com-

mando I, where we work with parolees between the ages of 11 to 18. We found one of the great problems in our community was that the parolees needed jobs, but the state child-labor law said they couldn't work in stores until they were 16. So, we talked to merchants, and we had the state law changed for the first time since 1919.

We had something like 200 kids working last year, 11-18, in stores, — black, white, and Spanish-American. The Labor Department sent two officials down and they approved it. This year we got something like 265 kids working for us between the ages of 11 to 20.

MR. SCHREIBER: May I ask what is the employment age law now?

MR. WALTERS: It now allows a kid 13 years of age to work four hours a day after school, and a young lady between 16-18 can work up until 11 o'clock at night, instead of only to 9 p.m.

MRS. PINKETT: Is this an exception for your program alone or is it for Wisconsin as a whole?

MR. WALTERS: For the state as a whole, because our program is being established in other cities in the state, like Racine.

MR. PIERCE: Some of the guys in the Commando I project went to school while in institutions and took their training programs. When they come out of the institutions, they are sent right back to school, and this isn't what they really want. If we could find out what they are really interested in, like if one learned welding in the institution, why not give him that when he gets out? You may find some who don't want to read books, and want to work with their hands. A lot of these kids are learning trades like welding or auto mechanics. But once they get back on the street, they have no one to take any interest in them or get them into a school system where they can learn and continue to learn.

MR. SADOFSKY: I think Mr. Walters has suggested for us that perhaps instead of talking about jobs for the youth under the age of 16 that, Commando Project I is really oriented more toward job training and vocational preparation rather than full-time jobs for kids under the age of 16.

PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL ALTERNATIVES

MR. SADOFSKY: We also have a number of stirrings in the community, in regard to alternatives to public education. For example, in the "street academies" and other new forms of education that are springing up and are as yet unevaluated. We may regard them as demonstrations of what may be possible and as potentially parallel institutions.

In short, when we spoke about the rigidities of public policy, I don't think that Eli was suggesting, and I know I wasn't, that the kids at the age of 14 or 15 be eliminated from exposure to education.

MISS LEVIN: We have spent a great deal of time visiting the street academies from the beginning, and periodically surveying the development of these academies, and we are enormously impressed with what they do. We

also visited a so-called street academy set up by the Board of Education and were very disappointed.

MRS. ALTES: We recognize that street academies are playing an important role, but in terms of the law as it exists, in terms of the charge given the Bureau of Attendance, enforcing the compulsory education law, we are in a bind on this because the law hasn't been modified.

MR. MUNK: From what I understand the structure of the street academies to be as of now, there are 16 located mainly in 4 ghetto areas in the city, and they are really not schools. They don't purport to be schools, but rather agencies for motivating kids to learn. They work through street workers, through informal discussion. There are now, in Harlem, two "academies of transition," which are the second stage of the street academies, and there it is a much more formally structured process. So that if there are problems of certification, I imagine they would be at that level rather than street academies. The third level are the college prep schools, such as Harlem Prep.

One interesting case is the Christian Action Ministry (CAM) Academy in Chicago, similarly directed at black youngsters in the Chicago ghetto. They have several programs: one is 9th grade equivalency, one high school and one college prep. They applied for federal ESEA funds, and were denied because anyone receiving them has to be certified by the local school board. CAM did not get the approval of the Chicago School Board; therefore, did not get any federal funds.

MR. KAUFMAN: In Pennsylvania, where we ran an experimental program for school drop-outs which would result in a diploma, we were told by people in education that there were certain rules and regulations that had to be followed.

Then we got a copy of the rules and regulations — which are certainly not easy things to get — and we discovered that there are always interesting clauses in these, for example, which say that for experimental purposes the superintendent can do this or that. So we had to write a letter for the Superintendent of Schools and then to the State Department of Education, but we found we were able to do almost anything we wanted.

MRS. BLANCHE KATZ (Public Education Association, N.Y.C.):

I want to point out the problem has to be separated here. As I understand it, in Harlem Prep and some of the street academies, most of the young people are over the legal age for drop-out anyway, so they wouldn't run into any trouble as far as the law is concerned.

MRS. ALTES: Harlem Prep is unusual, and they are generally college-bound kids and older kids. There are street academies, however, springing up all over the place, that are taking kids as young as 14 years of age, and when you ask them about how come he is not in regular school, they say they don't care. If the kid walks in off the street, they just take him. They don't even know what the law is and they think we are just interfering. But,

the New York State Compusory Education Law says that instruction elsewhere than at a public school shall be at least substantially equivalent as that given to a minor of like age and attainments at a public school in the city. Now, this is broad, but there are certain safeguards. A kid can't just walk in or not, or come in for one hour and then disappear. These are some of the things we are working on now with the street academies. It can't be a loose arrangement whereby you take any kid who might show up for a day or two and not show up again, and this is what is happening.

MRS. CARR: But if a kid walks in and says "I want to learn," I think that we should arrange some kind of policy that allows that. From what I know of these street academies the attendance is superb. They just do not walk in one day and leave the next.

MR. McDIVITT: I think it is just obvious that there have to be alternatives to the traditional school system, and I think it is futile to continue to attempt to whip kids back into the traditional school system.

MRS. ALTES: I think the alternatives again have to be sound alternatives.

MR. KAUFMAN: But this is making the assumption that the existing operation is sound itself. Every time we want to conduct an experimental program, you test it for "soundness," on the assumption that what is being done now is sound.

MRS. ALTES: The street academies depend upon money. Suppose they go out of business?

MR. KAUFMAN: But what is happening to the kids in the regular school system?

MRS. ALTES: I am not arguing that the present school system is a panacea for all kids. Far from it. I think its huge size in itself is against it. Where you get individualized attention, that's better, of course, but you just can't have a loose structure.

MR. KAUFMAN: Why not? You are concerned about ther walking in and out. You might discover, in a school system where the youngster knows he has the opportunity to walk in and walk out and quit, that his attendance record is better over the long run than in a school that imposes a set of regulations, and I say it ought to be tested out.

MRS. ALTES: I am not arguing this point, but I say we have to be concerned with the youngster who goes into a street academy although his parents may not want him to go, and which doesn't keep roll books as the law demands. You have to change the law on this. If the kids drop out, or if the street academy goes out of business, there has to be someone to follow up. You just can't make it too loose.

MRS. GIDA CAVICCHIA (Board of Education, N.Y.C.):

I did a program in the high school for potential dropouts for the past six years. It started out for 2300 public school youngsters, 14-16, who were not working up to potential, and, of course, most of the youngsters in the program are socially disadvantaged.

The traditional curriculum has not succeeded because if it had, most of these children would not be disenchanted with school. So we changed our curriculum in every subject area. We introduced areas that were of interest, which gave them vocational and pre-vocational training. Of the 2300 youngsters who were going to be dropouts from society, we got all of them into high schools except 12, and I don't think any other drop-out program succeeded in this. I have had no trouble at all attracting teachers.

Their reading scores soared, sometimes five years. Even with the teachers' strikes we had this year and with the unrest in the public schools! So I don't feel disheartened. Education by itself, and even pro-vocational training, is nothing by itself. This year we got 1,500 part-time jobs for our youngsters in that age group, and this is not at all an easy thing to accomplish. Not only that, but we have employers who call upon us year after year, because we follow these children through. We just don't give them a job so they have money in their pocket. We want training for them.

However, you have the group that cannot and will not and should not go to school, and these youngsters should be trained in industry when they are 14 and 15. The problem I have there is with the unions. I called up Van Arsdale's office — this was five years ago. I got lots of tea and sympathy. He was going to make posters that say "Keep Your Child in School." Well! This is not going to keep them in school.

MR. MUNK: I just wondered, in view of the success of the program, whether you have had any enrollment from 14 or 15 year old parolees and probationers.

MRS. CAVICCHIA: We have a screening procedure where the youngsters are taken into the program, but they are not living up to it.

MR. GOLDEN: Some parolees get in there but it's through the social workers.

MR. MUNK: What does it depend on?

MR. GOLDEN: Most of the time the parolee would be the one most likely to drop out, but career guidance classes are the ones with the most receptive teachers, so if we are taking the child back into the school, we go where there are known career guidance classes.

MRS. PINKETT: I would like to mention that vocational education provisions are made under the 1968 amendments to the Vocational Educational Act, and these plans are now being approved. Under these amendments, programs for youngsters would be provided to give these problem youngsters the opportunity to explore different careers. The curriculum would be flexible, and they could come in and out as they reach the level of their achievement. So if we are talking about short-range programs here, perhaps the street academies need to coordinate with programs that are in existence. I should like to say something about the child labor laws. Unfortunately, if under the federal law we made a list of what they can do, it would be such a short list, it would be embarrassing. And unless the state

and federal child labor laws and the federal laws are changed we are handicapped.

MR. KAUFMAN: Let me tell you this on Vocational Education. I asked Mr. Martin Essex, who is chairman of the board that wrote the report on the Advisory Council of Vocational Education, what evidence he has that all of the new provisions and all of the extra money suggested under the Vocational Education amendments of 1968 would be achievable within the framework and thinking of the Vocational Educational establishment which exists in the 50 states, and I have yet to hear the answer to that particular question.

We know that the Vocational Educational establishments in this country are not capable of meeting special needs. They are trying to make second class education, which has been described as Vocational Education, first class. I would defy anyone to show me significant programs in the last six years in Vocational Education that in any way are exemplary or meet special needs of any sort.

MRS. PINKETT: I had reference to the 1968 **amendments**, and I think that this is true. I have worked very closely with the new programs that they are trying to implement, and the only thing I can say is the fact that Congress saw the need to lower the age to include 14 and 15 year olds in the Vocational Educational Act.

MISS LEVIN: I would like to throw out another idea. Earlier, Mr. Cohen mentioned as one of the counter trends a most significant development which was an outgrowth of the Civil Rights movement, with big business becoming involved in education. In New York big business is considering entering into a partnership with a couple of high schools, and this reminds me of some of the schools I saw on a tour of Eastern Europe where schools were set up under the auspices of unions which were job training centers for young people. There, industry was directly concerned and interested in the training of these young people who spent some of their time in the classroom with skilled craftsmen, and some of it on the job, and this seemed to me to be an eminently satisfactory way of developing skilled, respectable job situations, which were sufficiently prestigious so that young people looked upon them with great favor.

MRS. ALTES: We have found in trying to get small business people in the neighborhood to give some work experience for high school kids that in most cases we draw a blank. If there were some public subsidies given to these small businessmen to pay part of the salary of the youngsters who would be with them, I think they would be more apt to look at this a little more favorably.

MR. GOLDEN: This is where the Neighborhood Youth Corps comes in because they pay $37.50 a week.

We have also suggested the alternative of modifying the minimum wage laws to allow for any situation that could be certified as being educational

in nature so that it would not fall under the minimum wage for full-time employment.

MR. SADOFSKY: We are talking about a commitment from a group of employers and from the unions in those industries where there is a critical shortage of at least semi-skilled labor, so that there is a possibility for development through entry level jobs into higher paying jobs. If one assumes you can start with 14 and 15 year old kids, and if you assume further that you can provide them not with six months of training, but with training over a sizeable period of time, then that is substantially different from the Job Corps.

MR. SADOFSKY: Yesterday, I suggested that possibly one might seek to expand the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps to age 14 and combine that with a strong educational component, to the point where youth, who are obviously not attending school regularly, would be recognized under the law as being provided with an educational experience along with a work experience.

MISS WELCH: I would support it.

MRS. ALTES: You have to remember you have to modify the law, because the law now states that they cannot leave school until they are 17 with a job, so that if you are going to make any proposals then your proposal also has to have in it some bill to modify the present law. And the law says they must have state certified teachers, they must have equivalent education, and we have interpreted that as the local superintendent going out and reviewing the curriculum and seeing whether or not they would consider it equivalent.

MR. DANCE: You can come up with all of these short-range policies, but you have to think in terms of where are the policy implications going to hit hardest as it relates to the job objectives in terms of the entire population and on a national level. In the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we can handle only ten per cent of the eligibles, and when I say eligibles, I mean people that could be in our program. Now you are going to extend our age limit two years in the other direction. You are going to up us by I don't know how many millions.

MR. KAUFMAN: I have a suggestion of where you can get the money. Let's say some of the youngsters spend half a day in school, half in working. Obviously, schools now have resources released — it costs them less — and so we ought to get the schools to make payments for the youngsters in this kind of a program.

MR. DANCE: Good, very good. I like your approach.

MRS. ALTES: The school board won't buy that.

MR. KAUFMAN: I noticed a good deal of our discussion always centered around boys. Is the problem different with 14-15 year old girls?

MR. SAMUEL LEVINE (Community Service Bureau):

I don't think the girls' problems are really that much school-related as

the boys. At least not from our experience. I would hazard a guess that if you looked at the girl population in our training school system, probably 85 per cent of their difficulties are probably sexually related.

Whereas, if you look at the history of the boys that we get, it will run the gamut but always in the middle is a real lousy school situation, or school experience.

MRS. LINDA BAILEY (Center for Study of the Unemployed):

I participated in a follow-study of the 1958 Central Law Junior High School graduating class, and here the majority of those students that had left school during Junior High School were girls, and they were pregnant, which you can say is not a school issue, but it was a school policy that forced them out of the schools. The fact that they didn't get on parole or probation can be attributed to studies that show by and large parole officers are more lenient toward girls.

MR. DAMIANO: I think it depends on the community. There are some areas upstate that would have brought those pregnant girls into the State Training school.

MRS. ALTES: Now the School policy in New York City has changed. The policy now is no longer to especially exclude them from schools, unless the parents do so. We at the Bureau of Attendance followed up all the pregnant girls, and at least half would not return to school when we gave them the opportunity to return after having given birth.

I know that in the truancy case figures we have, there is a larger number of boy truants than there are girls, and girls' problems are very often related to the parental relationship, in which the parent will seek to be more protective of the girl and keep the girl home. We call these unlawful detention cases, where they keep them home to mind younger kids, or they feel their emphasis is on getting a good husband. Consequently, there is a different kind of concept that the parent has toward girls; some are very restrictive toward girls, more so than boys.

MR. GOLDEN: I might point out in the attitude on employment, employers are more reluctant to hire girls. In my experience, girls don't come asking for work in that age grouping. When they do, they are closer to 16 and they would be on the lower end of the wage scale, and most of them when they come will ask either for nurse's aid jobs, or babysitting jobs, relating possibly to the role experienced within the home, or maternal feelings that they may have.

IV LONG-RANGE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

DR. NIXON: We are now going to shift gears from short-range to long-range problems, to more general policy and more long-range changes. We mean by this — what changes in public policy are necessary in order to

come to grips with this problem — what legislative changes ought to be made — what institutional changes may be required?

Foreign Experience

MRS. KATZ: One of the things that distinguishes the United States from many of the European countries is that we have had for generations the concept of upward mobility, so that the kind of highly structured work preparation that might be effective in another country might not be effective here, because people resent the kind of tracking into that takes place in these other systems, and I think we cannot make automatic analogies here.

Now, there are several observations about the present situation we ought to remember. One is that jobs for young people between the ages of 16 and 25 are going to become increasingly in short supply.

The second is that the opportunities for higher education and continued education have expanded and are expanding enormously. With all the difficulty that the City University is having meeting its budget, they have projected by 1975 a structure which will provide higher education to 100 per cent of the graduating classes of our high schools.

The problem of the schools is a very long-standing one. Drop-out rates have always been very high from the beginning of the secondary school system. In the past, however, youngsters who dropped out were readily absorbed into the labor market, and you know, some of them even became enormous successes. Without high school diplomas they made a million dollars, and so on. This is a situation that no longer exists, of course. What happened was that in the 1930's, with the depression, our kids remained in school, and for the first time the failures of the school system became visible. We began to see that we hadn't been succeeding. We see now our high schools are failing, even with the "white middle class children". The circle is widening, and clearly something radical has to be done, some total restructuring of secondary education.

We have heard talk here of expanding the Job Corps and having new structures, but I want to submit to you that the school structure exists, and we are funneling billions of dollars into it. Our problem is to make that structure more responsive to the needs of the kids.

MR. SADOFSKY: I think one of the things that Mrs. Katz has done is to raise the prevalent issue: When you have a social problem, a persistent social problem, and, when you have scarce resources — and you always have scarce resources — do you attempt to support refinements of the existing institution, or do you attempt to go outside of the institution to locate some solutions?

Mr. Groemping made rather a signal contribution to the Princeton Symposium on Manpower, suggesting that this whole transitional problem from school to work is handled in other industrialized Western countries in a much

ERATUM

- under remarks of Mr. Franz Groemping (U.S. Department of Labor) first paragraph should read:

I think that the European youth are better adjusted to their society. Perhaps that is because European societies are so much less heterogeneous than ours is.

better manner, apparently, with a great deal less disruption and a great many fewer negative consequences for youth than takes place in our own country. These studies of his and others suggest that there are solutions, and I can't believe that we are so different to make this a totally impossible kind of a problem. I'd like him to tell us something about the European experience.

MR. FRANZ GROEMPING (U.S. Dept. of Labor):

I think that the European youth are better adjusted to their society. Perhaps that is because European societies are so much less democratic that ours is.

Let's take the first point of personal needs. In some countries, personal needs seem to be better met than they are here at home. That is partly because of the institutional set-up. In Europe, labor unions do a better job taking care of their own than our unions do. Perhaps the reason is that they are basically more ideological than American unions.

The word "Socialism" has been a cuss word here over many years, but European unions, which usually call themselves socialist, do a better job of taking care of their youth; and, more important, its youth talks for itself. In meetings in recent years the youth has been giving the old folks hell, and the old folks in the national union leadership have been listening. I haven't seen much of that here.

Then, on the job, there is a much better youth and adult worker relationship, again because of a better institutional set-up. It is not that the adult Frenchman and the adult Englishman is kinder to the kids than the American adult. Far from it. But it is a built-in relationship which represents all workers in a plant. The counselors have a responsibility for the "social welfare" of the workers, including the youth in the plant, and they do take care of it.

On the next point, employment. Youth unemployment in Europe is less than we have. One reason is that they don't have the tremendous percentage of young people as we have. This country has the post-war birth increase which has done something to our labor force structure. We have far more youth to take care of than other countries have.

On education, the European situation used to be very inflexible, but they have made adjustments. The old academic high school, which started in some countries at the age of ten and which separated the worker's child from the middle class child at age ten (meaning anyone whose parents could afford it, would go to high school while others would go to grade school, quit at age 14 and then go to work) has changed. Comprehensive high schools are now quite accepted in Europe. Also, kids can switch back into education and become professionals. This is especially true in engineering.

One advantage the Europeans have, and that is that there are more jobs for the minorities. Here there are minority jobs, and that is one of the evils

in this country. In Europe there are no jobs which are not respected, because they have not been assigned to any minority, to any disadvantaged group.

Compulsory School Attendance Or Work

DR. NIXON: On a long-range basis, let me ask you what your reaction is in regard to compulsory school attendance age. It is 16 now. Should it be kept there? Should it be just as rigid with emphasis on enforcement? Should it be raised to 17 or 18 or should it be made flexible, with a whole variety of marginal adjustments possible here?

MR. GOLDEN: That is not the problem. I would say it would matter not one way or the other.

MR. MUNK: I would interpret what Mr. Golden and several other people have said, that the issue is not the level at which we legally require kids to attend school but rather to improve the level of education, which is a perfectly defensible position to take.

If industry will not hire 16, 17 and 18 year olds — and the statistics would seem to bear this out, — then our public policy has to say what are we going to do with these young people during this period. Then the question is what kind of learning experience, living experiences, can we provide for these young people during this time, so that they will be ready for work and life when they have reached the age at which society thinks they should be. We are not going to have, at least in the visible future, jobs for 14, 15 and 16 year olds. Let's face it.

MRS. KATZ: We should recognize that underlying these statements is the assumption that the longer the kids stay in school, the easier will their transition be into the labor market at some future stage and the less will be the likelihood of their delinquency. I think we ought to recognize we are basing this on some assumptions about transition from school to work, and I think we ought to try to clarify these and not focus so much on individual approaches to improving the quality of education. It is really the assumptions of the educational system and our thinking about the age in which transition could best be made that is most relevant to this discussion.

MRS. ALTES: I say that if you did lower the compulsory education law, under the assumption that if they were then working they would not get into trouble, you would probably find that a kid could keep a job for a day or two and that the same frustrations that make him drop out of school would make him leave the job. There is no guarantee that if you get him a job that he is going to stick to it and become a productive citizen and not get into problems with delinquency.

Secondly, from my own experience with truant kids in this age group in a group counseling situation, when you first ask them what is it that is keeping them from attending school, they always project it on the school situation — on the teachers or on the course of study — they say that they want to go to work but as they stay in the counseling sessions longer, they begin to

assess their own personal problems, and then they begin talking about problems with their families, problems about their own needs that are not being met and it becomes more of a personalized situation. When those kids who gain some insight into why it is that they are staying out of school and begin to see that they themselves have problems, they begin to attend more regularly.

So that doesn't mean we should not modify attendance laws; but for the 14 and 15 year old, I would hesitate thinking that just because you are going to change public policy you are thereby going to make them more productive citizens.

MR. GOLDEN: We could leave 16 as the compulsory age, but for those who feel they must work, have a little flexibility so that the child that drops out to work, so to speak, doesn't just get kicked out of the system altogether. Thus, from 14 to 18 a youth could choose school-related work. He is not consigned to work and work alone. Then, the employer knows he is employed under those circumstances, and there is some place in this whole legal structure for both the child and the employer to operate, without the danger of saying this is illegal employment.

MISS WELCH: Also, we might add that when a youngster reaches 16 years of age, he will not be forced out of school but he could go back if he so desired ofter 16.

MR. McDIVITT: Instead of talking about lowering compulsory education to 14, if you kept it at 16 but then redefined what we mean by education in terms of a different kind of educational experience, then some of these programs could qualify as compulsory education.

I think if you reduce the compulsory education age to 14, then you have nobody responsible for the educational experience training of these kids. You just cast them adrift. Instead of looking at compulsory education as a punitive thing as far as the kid is concerned, if we turned it around and looked at compulsory education as compulsory on the educational system to provide a viable educational experience for the kids, then I think this is the kind of direction that I would like to see.

MR. SADOFSKY: I think few of us around the table would advocate reducing the compulsory school attendance laws. There may be some who would like some exceptions made for particular kinds of youth, who are obviously not going to make it, but as a matter of public policy, it seems to me we are all relatively clear about the necessity for kids to get as much education as they possibly can today. The real goal here is not actual reduction of the age from 16 to 14, or some other magic number, but: Are there educational alternatives, and who ought to be sponsoring these educational alternatives?

For example, it is very clear that many of us have a pessimistic view of the ability of the present educational system in this country to change within the next few years, so that this generation of 14 to 15 year olds will not be exposed to the kind of education that we feel ought to be delivered to them,

to say nothing about the complexities involved in determining what that new concept of education ought to be.

MR. GOLDEN: Our concern is that there are some young people who mature early and can be productive. I think we can recognize that such youngsters need experience, when coming in on an entry level, and that they are learning some basic skills.

MRS. ALTES: What bothers me, Mr. Golden, in all this is you are working with the 14 year old who may have part-time jobs, but it is not his sole learning experience. He is still in school. He may not be, and we are talking here about some kind of programs that will keep him in longer. But are you saying it's okay for a kid fourteen years old to go into full-time working experience if he can get money?

MR. GOLDEN: No. I would not suggest full-time work for the 14 year old.

MR. SADOFSKY: I would like to go back to the basic point that Mr. Cohen made in discussing our child labor laws and entry age into the labor market. The principal thrust of his remarks was that our current policies are adjusted to the needs of the labor market, to the needs of the employers and to the requirement of capital for price stability. We might question whether we wish to continue to live with this public policy, or whether we take more seriously what is in the best interests of the kids. Nobody has mentioned, for example, the possibility of developing public employment here beyond the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

If we actually believe that the private sector is limited in providing the work experiences youth require for maturation, and if we want to join that with educational and maturation needs, then we might begin to think in terms of appropriate forms of public employment for kids even at the age of 14.

I despair a bit because whenever we get into these questions, we run into things that we regard almost as sacrosanct: the private sector of the economy, the existing institutions, the existing laws.

DR. NIXON: That adds an absolutely essential dimension to this discussion. If we assume that the present level of employment has to be taken as a limit, then you accept that we have an enormously high unemployment rate amongst youth. In our economy as a whole we do not have full employment, it is not operating, at maximum efficiency.

One of the differences in the European situation is that the unemployment rates overall in Europe are about one-half of what they are here. That difference between 4 per cent and 2 per cent is an enormous one. When you have that kind of change, the impact of that change rests in a multiplied way on the marginal sections of your labor forces, the older workers, the handicapped workers and youth. So there can be no solution of this problem short of having a much tighter labor market.

MR. MUNK: Let me read the conclusion on the transition from school to work that was drawn at the symposium in Princeton by the leading experts

in the field last year. After pointing out the ironic situation that exists in the United States: on the one hand, the policy of keeping a larger proportion of its youth in school for a longer period of time on the assumption that the better prepared they will be for work; on the other, the much higher proportion of teenage joblessness in the United States than other industrialized countries, this group of experts unanimously attributed this to:

> "Apparently in so far as conscious decisions were made on national economic policy in these countries, the issues in the trade-off between full utilization of human resources and price stability were resolved on the basis of a different set of priorities and political imperative."

This, it seems to me, is the heart of the problem. The experts stated that public policy in the United States is based on the necessity of keeping kids out of the labor market for as long a period of time as possible because, instead of having a manpower policy that is designed to fully utilize all of our national resources, it is designed to keep some level of unemployment always in existence in the United States, according to this panel of experts, because of the need for price stability. This is the notion that every time unemployment drops, inflation occurs, so in the longest run it seems to me that this is the basic public policy that affects all of our compulsory education, child labor, hazardous employment — everything that affects transition from school to work.

DR. NIXON: So far we have been wrestling and struggling with the question of our long-range policy recommendations. Now I am going to tell you what my recommendations are, and I am going to assume that anybody that is silent agrees with them.

1. We cannot deal effectively with the problem of unemployment and juvenile delinquency in the age range of 14 to 15 years unless a public policy of reducing unemployment to 2 per cent is adopted as the highest priority, if necessary establishing the government as the employer of last resort. This means we consider the achievement of reduced unemployment at roughly the rates that hold in Western Europe as having a higher priority than that of avoiding inflation.

This means that, as a central goal, we seek to reduce rates of unemployment of youth, to less than 5 per cent.

2. We reduce the eligibility age for all work training programs to 14 years of age. That means MDTA, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps and JOBS, which means you pay subsidies to private employers for training and job development for youth at the age of 14.

3. We amend the State compulsory Education Laws age to introduce flexibility at the age of 14, which would permit adjustment of the educational system and allow youngsters to go into employment or employment training after the age of 14.

4. We change the whole educational system to permit continuous linear

progression of education, instituting a work and training program in which youngsters, beginning at the age of 14, can move in or out, perhaps until 18. In other words, work and training is integrated at the age of 14 with school at the choice of the student under appropriate counseling guidance.

5. That in every youth parole and probation system you develop your own employment, job development, job creation, work evaluation, work referral program as an integral part of the entire process of youth corrections.

MRS. PINKETT: I think you have fine recommendations here, but you also have to amend all of the relevant state and federal child labor, hazardous employment and other laws to implement your recommendations.

DR. NIXON: I agree.

DELINQUENCY AND PUBLIC POLICY

MRS. KATZ: Do you recognize the danger in Numbers 2 and 3 with respect to states that would be just delighted to get out of their responsibilities for compulsory education?

My alternative is not eliminate the compulsory education laws but to make sure that from the ages of 14 to 16, or 18, flexible arrangements be made to provide for continuing education and work training at the expense of the communities and state involved.

MRS. PINKETT: I also question whether you need to reduce the compulsory school attendance age because some of the other recommendations promote a longer compulsory school attendance age.

Is not your point No. 2, inconsistent with point No. 1? If you are going to reduce the rate of unemployment before you can do anything for 14 and 15 year olds, then how at the same time do you propose a partnership of earning and learning and a reduction of the minimum age law in the various acts in existence?

MR. McDIVITT: If you reduce the compulsory age to 14, then you give the school system an out, and you cast the kids adrift. If you left it at 16 and then provided administrative flexibility, the school's responsibility is still there, I think it is a significant difference.

MR. LEVINE: I am still concerned about administrative flexibility. Was it administrative flexibility that made it possible to suspend automatically 700 kids at Franklin K. Lane, as happened here in New York City this winter?

MR. SADOFSKY: Why not make the administrative flexibility at the option of the youth? Let the youth himself, at the age of 14, initiate it rather than the school system.

(Calls of, "No, no, no, no.")

MR. McDIVITT: I think what I sense we would be looking for would be provisions, and maybe it is provisions in law, I don't know, but provisions whereby you could qualify alternative programs (not necessarily in the traditional school system) which would meet the compulsory education requirements.

MRS. KATZ: May I just add that as a point of information, the New York

state education law makes the school systems of the State responsible to provide education to anyone up to the age of 21 who wishes it.

MR. WEBER: I know this is going to sound facetious, but perhaps a more radical thing would be to get away from this idea of even coercing youngsters to attend school. Where does the government enter? Why don't we think of a policy in terms of compelling the states to provide a quality educational service, and then you can measure the efficacy of this service by the number of kids that participate in it?

DR. NIXON: Would that mean complete elimination of compulsory education?

MR. WEBER: Exactly!

MR. WALLACE: When you talk about such changes in compulsory education, I would suggest that a beginning could be the elimination of truancy from the jurisdiction of the juvenile courts. If we are not providing a service that delivers, then why the hell should anybody have to buy it?

(Agreement was expressed around the room)

MRS. ALTES: I am concerned about the statement about doing away with compulsion to attend a school. Mississippi and South Carolina decided to do away with their compulsory education law, for reasons of their own. This can be very easily subverted in an effort to stop integration.

If you say "why compel when people are not buying it", I say it is absurd to think that a 14 year old kid knows what's good for him. At this age he thinks he wants out, and he wants to work. He can't stand frustration. If he goes out to work, he will soon find other frustrations there. As mature individuals, we have to recognize that a kid of 14 cannot decide for himself as to what his entire future is going to be. The very adolescent period he is going through is one of chaos and insecurity and conflict. Are we going to add one more conflict — make up your mind what you are going to be from now on?

MR. McDIVITT: I think we have subverted the compulsory education law, as I understand it. I understand that it was originally enacted to protect kids, and the compulsion was on the parent to keep the kid in school and to attempt to keep the parent from keeping the kid out of school.

MRS. ALTES: And to guarantee each child the right to an education.

MR. McDIVITT: But we have subverted it to the point where we are using it now to punish the kid.

MRS. ALTES: I don't know why you say that.

MR. McDIVITT: The very act of the truants coming in to the correctional system.

MRS. ALTES: But the point of truancy is really that this is a symptom. We are not using the truancy law to punish the truant.

MR. WALLACE: I agree with the business of it being subverted, because if truancy is the symptom, the courts are not going to do anything about that symptom. That's what I understand when I see kids go on to training schools,

because most training schools in most states provide an inferior education to what they would be getting in the public schools. So what we have done is take a kid who isn't satisfied with a school and we send him into an inferior education, and we are saying now we have satisfied ourselves because we have upheld the law. All I am adding to that is that we send a helluva lot of kids on criminal careers because they've got school problems.

MRS. ALTES: First of all, the number of placements to training schools because of truancy alone is so infinitesmal that it is hardly worth talking about. When we go into the family court for help with the truancy problem, it is as a protection for the child, and also as a help to him, as a help for service. We don't always get this, but this is the philosophy behind it. Further than that, I would say that it is important to think in terms of keeping education to 16 compulsory but to link it up with individualized and flexible programs within the educational setup.

We get about a thousand petitions a year, but actual placement in a state training school, that number is very small.

MR. MUNK: In New York State in 1966-67, 20 per cent of all PIN's cases were only for truancy.

MR. LEVINE: I could count on the fingers of one hand the number of kids that I have seen come into the training school system who came to us because of truancy alone. You will not find a training school case where the kid came to us because his only problem in the community was that he would not go to school. Somehow we are taking an extremely complex socioeconomic and cultural phenomenom, and in some way constantly project it on to the school system.

MR. MUNK: The point, in broader perspective, is not how many youth were sent to training school for habitual truancy, but how many have been brought into the juvenile justice system, which requires expenditure of funds, and personnel. In that sense the probation, parole and attendance bureaus are probably much more overburdened than the schools.

MR. WEBER: In 1965 I traveled around the country in 35 of our 50 states, and I would have to disagree with the comments being made here about the New York training school and impact of truancy. It is obviously hard to get data in this area. People describe things with a variety of terms — incorrigibility — waywardness — very seldom do they say truancy. They say criminal offense. They are talking about problem kids, and it's like John Wallace said, the juvenile system is an inappropriate mechanism for dealing with them. We've got to stop talking about it as a philosophy to help kids. It is a penal system.

THE LABOR MARKET

MRS. CAVICCHIA: According to the first point, you say let's reduce unemployment among the younger children.

There are plenty of jobs, but our children are not trained, and we do something with the unions, where they will give us apprenticeships and open up

their doors to our youngsters who are 14. We have to do something about the one who wants to leave school at 14. You say we have to provide for him to get some other kind of training. Let him go into an industry with an open book with the union, but at the same time let us also provide for the child who rehabilitates himself, changes his attitudes in life and wants to come back into the regular school. Just reducing the unemployment percentage, per se, is nothing.

We know the skills of a 14 year old child are practically nil. Our youngsters of 14 are not ready to go out to work, and we are importing people from Europe to fill some of our jobs because we don't have people equipped or trained. The unions refuse to train, to open doors, because if they put youngsters in an apprenticeship program, then they must admit them into the plumbing union, for example. And unless your father was a plumber and you have a white card, you cannot join that plumbing union, and you cannot work as a plumber.

MR. MUNK: We do have some data on the proportion of jobs that are open to youth at various age levels. Below the age of 14, only about 20 per cent of all jobs are open—presumably those in agriculture, during the summer, etc. Between 14 and 16, approximately 45 per cent of the jobs are open, again remembering that for this age group as well as that below 14 these are open only ofter school hours and during vacation time, and it is also excluded from factory employment, operating certain types of power driven machinery, and so on.

After 16, 95 per cent of the jobs become open, leaving only those covered by hazardous employment occupations, which include a lot of the higher-paying jobs in construction and transportation. At 18 we go up to 99 per cent, with only a few remaining jobs in handling radioactive materials, and so on, that are open only to 21 years and over.

We get a picture of a kind of funnel in the labor market. It is very narrow at the beginning of one's physical ability to work, say around the age of 12, and widens out all the way open at 21.

MR. WEBER: Reducing the unemployment rate from four to two per cent, strikes me as somewhat ludicrous. In the first place, over twenty years ago when Congress passed the full employment act, and as far as I know the public policy of the United States is full employment. On the other hand, there is the economic reality. I an not an economist, but my suspicion is that we can anticipate the unemployment rate to rise next year, not be reduced.

I say this because of the present administration's concern about inflation, and a result of any activity in controlling inflation, will be a higher unemployment rate.

My third comment is on the nature of the labor force. I think that there is a considerable amount of data showing a decrease in the size of the labor force in the 1970's. On the other side of that coin, is the whole issue of new careers, developing new jobs in new areas, either through government being

the employer of last resort, or in developing new career lines in the human services field.

These are crucial to a consideration of the unemployment and training problems of the 15 and 14 year old.

DR. NIXON: You raise some very interesting questions. Just as a matter of fact, we never passed the Full Employment Act. The legislation passed in 1946 was called the Employment Act of 1946. You are accurate in saying that originally (as introduced by Senator Wagner) it was called the Full Employment Act, but when Robert Taft got through with it on the Senate floor, they took out the "full employment" language and substituted "maximum employment consistent with our free enterprise system". This was a very fundamental change.

What is at issue here, is whether or not it is accurate that if you are to create the employment opportunities for marginal people that you have to go a couple of notches below the four per cent level.

There is not necessarily a trade-off of employment for inflation. It is putting a high degree of employment as first priority, and finding other means than slowing down the economy to deal with the problem of inflation. The last time we had full employment in this country was during World War II, and at that time the participation rates of youth went sky high, and we had young people 14, 15 years old doing very productive labor in our society because we had a low employment rate.

But I am just suggesting to you that so long as you maintain a rate of four per cent rather than two per cent, you leave a slack in the labor market which has its impact primarily on the marginal workers: the young workers, the black and brown workers, the older workers, and women. What lies at the basis of my suggestion is that if you are really going to create a general economic setting in which you can work out these problems, you need a tighter labor market comparable to that which exists in France, Japan, Great Britain, Canada and Germany.

I object to the presumption that only private employment in the profit system is productive employment. As far as I am concerned, policemen or firemen or street cleaners are all productively employed, and one of the great fallacies of our present day situation is unless you are employed privately and making demonstrable profit, you are not socially and economically useful.

MR. McDIVITT: If we are going to try to do something different for the 14 and 15 year olds and find some alternatives, we must loosen the kinds of restrictions that are now present in terms of the employment of the 14 and 15 year old.

I am not sure that we are so concerned about reducing the unemployment rate from 4 to 2 as we are in eliminating the restrictions which prevent us from doing what we are trying to do in the new deal for the 14 and 15 year old.

MR. SADOFSKY: Even full employment at the level of 2 per cent may not be satisfactory to us in terms of a long-range policy goal because we know that there are many people who are employed but underemployed. We know many people are employed part-time who want full-time jobs. We know many people who are employed full-time above the poverty level who are not really satisfied with their options. In short, even full employment seems like a modest goal in respect to what may be considered a total social need in regard to employment.

As long as we are talking about the kind of society in which we would like to live, what we are really saying in regard to employment is the development, from private as well as public sources, of a complete range of the best possible kinds of employment options. This would obviously affect the youth, whether they are below or above the age of 16.

I suppose if we were a more civilized society, we would certainly opt for the elimination of compulsion wherever it exists. At the moment, in many areas of our society, we have to maintain compulsion in order to get people to serve in the Armed Forces, and we have to maintain it to assure that people will go to school. But I would assume that our policies ought to minimize compulsion, and maximize available options, whether in the field of education or employment. Barring a youth of 14 or 15 who can work, who would prefer to work, is also a form of compulsion which I find abhorrent. Why can't we find the means to simply free a kid who can be a welder and do a productive job, which we now prohibit him from doing because he happens to be only 14 or 15? Compulsion also has certain kinds of psychological and social effects. I would not measure the effects of compulsion solely in terms of truancy. There are probably all kinds of hostile acts in which kids get involved, possibly as an escalating process in frustration with a public school education in a public school environment. Ultimately, this may burst through in truancy but it is probably manifested in a variety of ways before the individual becomes a truant or misbehaves in the classroom situation.

MR. WALLACE: In No. 4, we are talking about changing the linear educational system, permitting youth to go in and out. Doesn't this also have to be accomplished by a change in some of what we now call qualifications for entering into work?

One of the things I keep noting about Civil Service requirements is high school education, and we finally got a high school equivalency test, because an awful lot of people who never finished high school have capabilties for assuming responsible jobs within organizations.

Industry in some places is now beginning to change their qualifications. I can remember when U.S. Steel, in Indiana, required its workers to have a high school degree to run a wheelbarrow.

MRS. CAVICCHIA: How can you expect an employer to employ a 14 year old child at $1.69 an hour when he doesn't know how to do anything? We

have had to turn jobs down, and this is sad, because we said to these employers who called up, we cannot let you break the law; if we teach these children to work for less, then we are teaching them to break the law.

In many cases, an employer who wants to reap a profit, employs a 14 or 15 year old. We should have the minimum wage law amended for the 14 and 15 year old so that child can be trained.

MR. WILLIAM RESNICK (Mobilization for Youth):

Do we need more jobs, or do we have to open up the jobs? I am worried about this: You have an axe to grind about the unions. It may be that they are restrictive. But if they let a whole lot more black kids in, that would create a lot more white delinquents. If you let some kids in, other kids aren't going to get in. Do we have to provide more jobs or are there sufficient numbers of jobs and all we have to do is have more opportunity or lower credentials barriers, or something? This seems to be an essential question.

MISS JOYCE EPSTEIN (N.Y. State Division for Youth):

Your point about the union is correct, but most jobs aren't union jobs, and the real fault is not that the unions aren't letting people in, but that the job supply isn't adequate.

MRS. CAVICCHIA: I don't want them to enter the union. I want them to be trained. I don't care whether they are admitted to the union or not. But they will not give out apprenticeships to youngsters, because if they do put them in an apprenticeship program, then they must admit them five years from now into the union.

MR. RESNICK: And why is this?

MISS EPSTEIN: Is this because they don't have enough job openings?

MRS. CAVICCHIA: They want to keep the market high. You try getting a plumber, a carpenter.

MISS EPSTEIN: That's not the point. Are there really enough job openings to absorb all the employables?

MRS. CAVICCHIA: Of course there are job openings. But since the youngsters can't be trained, the unions won't open up to them. How many non-union plumbers are there?

MR. MUNK: On the general issue, is there an adequate number of jobs or is it a matter of putting more kids into those jobs available? If we take the construction industry as an example, the fact is the construction industry has one of the highest rates of unemployment of any occupational group today. It runs as high as 13 per cent, because the construction periods are highly seasonal, and during the winter you have mass layoffs in construction. That is one of the reasons why unions do try to preserve the number of jobs.

MR. GOLDEN: There are jobs available — union and non-union. Whether

or not to make these jobs accessible to the 14 year old is a horse of a different color.

DR. NIXON: In labor market economics over this decade there was a debate between those who felt that unemployment was structural and those who felt that unemployment was the result of the lack of demand.

The structural people said there are plenty of jobs but people don't have education, that there was discrimination, there are various structural barriers and all you need to do is clear away those structural barriers and everybody will get in and you will solve the problem. The demand people said we've got a stagnated economy — we don't have enough demand — and that we need a tight enough labor market and all of these so-called structural barriers will melt away and it will be all right.

That debate is now pretty well resolved in this fashion:

There are elements of veracity in both arguments. There are structural barriers to employment, as we have been talking about, but in order to get rid of them, you have to have the demand.

If you just break down the structural barriers and you do not of course have the demand situation, you will not really solve the problem. It simply means that to really solve the employment side of the problems of 14 and 15 year olds, you have to address yourself (1) to the overall demand situation which has to be healthy, tight, pressing and (2) to the barriers of Civil Service, private industry's excess qualification requirements, or labor union barriers, or racial discrimination, or the inadequate training or preparaton.

MR. MUNK: Isn't there a cause and effect relationship between the structural and demand sides of this problem? Haven't we noticed in times of tight labor market that where there is a large demand for workers that the barriers come down almost of their own accord, and conversely, in times of high unemployment that barriers, in terms of credentials and educational requirements, tend to be raised? Haven't we been witnessing over the past five or six years, as unemployment has declined, the dissolving of barriers, and if we see in the next several years a rise in unemployment, won't barriers be raised high?

DR. NIXON: I agree with you. There is a cause and effect relationship. Up in Buffalo they had a fairly tight labor situation and they dropped their high school requirements down to tenth grade and then they had relaxation in employment when the aircraft plant closed, and unemployment rose, and they went back up. However, in the tight situation that we had in the World War II, we did not eliminate high school requirements in Civil Service, nor did we eliminate racial discrimination. We lessened its impact, and I think for our purposes of clarifying this particular question, it is adequate if we say both of these factors have to be addressed. My bias is in the direction of the demand side, and that the hard demand necessarily leads to dissolution of a lot of these barriers. But, still, that leaves a lot of these institutional structural things to which attention has to be given.

MR. MUNK: I think this is particularly relevant to our public policy for 14 or 15 year olds, because this same kind of issue has historically influenced the age at which youth is expected to enter the labor force. Since the 18th century it has been raised from ten to approximately 16 or 18, reflecting the shrinking labor market over the past fifty years.

MRS. PINKETT: When you were saying to change the entire educational system to allow for work experience coupled with supervision, I would like to repeat something that I said yesterday, and that was that under the amendments of the Vocational Education Act of 1968, provisions are made for such programs. Provisions are made for supportive services and for counseling. Provisions are also made for employers to be reimbursed for expenditures over and above the normal cost invested in training 14 and 15 year olds, who have special needs, and I think the "special needs" there refers to the disadvantaged and the handicapped. "Disadvantaged," as I understand, is defined as those who have been academically deprived, and those who have socioeconomic problems. Therefore, instead of discussing whether or not you can change the educational system, maybe you need to tie in with that program as well as existing school programs to make sure that adequate safeguards are there.

I know we kind of beat that compulsory school attendance to death, but I think those laws, when they were passed, preceded the child labor laws, and historically they were thought of as paralleling each other, or complementing one another. Therefore, if you have a difference in an age limit for one, a minimum age for one that is different from another, you create administrative problems. Under the federal law, the minimum age for employment is actually 16, and only by special provision, granted by the Secretary of Labor, can 14 and 15 year olds be employed. In addition, you have in each state a child labor law, and both sets of laws affect the youngster, and when one is more rigid than the other, the one with the stricter standard applies. Now, with the extension of coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, you have very little employment in which youngsters can be employed that would not be covered. For 14 and 15 year olds, you also have several inconsistencies, which we attempted last year to correct, and which didn't get through.

For instance, we say that in a retail establishment a youngster can do this type of work, but since we don't say he can do it anywhere else, it means he can't do it. Then we have the overall prohibitive category of work in processing occupations. Now, processing occupations, has no fixed meaning. It has been interpreted to include any occupation that involved the change that a commodity undergoes to make it into a saleable form. This includes grinding of coffee, making a face powder, or similar jobs.

MR. DAMIANO: Are there jobs? When I started as a youth parole worker many years ago, I talked with employers. They asked many questions about

the problems the kid had. But in World War II things were different. They called me — **They** called me — and so long as he was 16 they were tickled pink to get him.

MR. SADOFSKY: We started at the beginning of this conference with the notion that public policy in regard to this whole problem of the transition from school to work of youth particularly as it affected 14 and 15 year old probationers and parolees was an extremely important one.

I think that the two days of discussions have tended to affirm and to elaborate aspects of it that somehow have not previously occurred to us.

I think that the general thrust of the recommendations that have been suggested here have been in the direction of attempting to find greater flexibility in the definition of public policy, and also in its administration. Beyond this, the general thrust of our recommendations has been to describe some of the desirable alternate options for youth in this age category and in this condition. So, from my point of view — and I think I speak also for the staff at the Center — that these two days have been extremely fruitful.